1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA 3 4 IN RE: Bard IVC Filters Products Liability Litigation,) MD 15-02641-PHX-DGC 5 6 Lisa Hyde and Mark Hyde, a married) Phoenix, Arizona 7 couple,) September 18, 2018 Plaintiffs, 8 9) CV 16-00893-PHX-DGC v. 10 C.R. Bard, Inc., a New Jersey corporation, and Bard Peripheral Vascular, an Arizona corporation, 11 12 Defendants. 1.3 14 15 BEFORE: THE HONORABLE DAVID G. CAMPBELL, JUDGE 16 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 17 TRIAL DAY 1 - A.M. SESSION 18 19 20 21 Official Court Reporter: Patricia Lyons, RMR, CRR 2.2. Sandra Day O'Connor U.S. Courthouse, Ste. 312 401 West Washington Street, SPC 41 23 Phoenix, Arizona 85003-2150 (602) 322-7257 24 Proceedings Reported by Stenographic Court Reporter 25 Transcript Prepared with Computer-Aided Transcription

1 APPEARANCES 2 For the Plaintiffs: 3 Lopez McHugh By: RAMON R. LOPEZ, ESQ. 4 100 Bayview Circle, Suite 5600 Newport Beach, CA 92660 5 Gallagher & Kennedy 6 By: MARK S. O'CONNOR, ESQ. By: PAUL L. STOLLER, ESQ. 7 2575 East Camelback Road, Suite 1100 Phoenix, AZ 85016 8 Heaviside Reed Zaic 9 By: JULIA REED ZAIC, ESQ. By: LAURA E. SMITH, ESQ. 10 312 Broadway, Ste. 203 Laguna Beach, CA 92651 11 Goldenberg Law PLLC 12 By: STUART GOLDENBERG, ESQ. By: MARLENE GOLDENBERG, ESQ. 1.3 800 LaSalle Ave., Ste. 2150 Minneapolis, MN 55402 14 Lopez McHugh, LLP 15 By: JOSHUA MANKOFF, ESQ. 1 International Plaza, #550 16 PMB-059 Philadelphia, PA 19113 17 18 19 For the Defendants: 20 Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough. BY: JAMES F. ROGERS, ESQ. 21 1320 Main St. Columbia, SC 29201 22 23 Snell & Wilmer By: JAMES R. CONDO, ESQ. 24 400 East Van Buren Phoenix, AZ 85004 25

APPEARANCES (CONTINUED) For the Defendants: Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough By: RICHARD B. NORTH, JR., ESQ. By: MATTHEW B. LERNER, ESQ. By: ELIZABETH C. HELM, ESQ. 201 17th Street NW, Suite 1700 Atlanta, GA 30363 C.R Bard, Inc. Associate General Counsel, Litigation By: GREG A. DADIKA, ESQ. 730 Central Avenue Murray Hill, New Jersey 07974

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 3 (The following proceedings took place in open court, 4 outside the presence of the jury panel.) 5 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: MDL 2015-23641, Bard IVC 6 filters product liability litigation, on for the jury trial 7 regarding Plaintiff Hyde. 8 Will the parties please announce. 9 MR. O'CONNOR: Yes. Good morning. Mark O'Connor for 10 the Plaintiffs Hyde. 11 MR. LOPEZ: Good morning, Your Honor. Ramon Lopez 12 for the Plaintiffs Hyde. 13 MS. REED ZAIC: Good morning, Your Honor. 14 Julia Reed Zaic for the Plaintiffs Hyde. 15 MR. ROGERS: Good morning, Your Honor. Jim Rogers on 16 behalf of defendants. 17 MS. HELM: Kate Helm on behalf of defendants. MR. CONDO: Morning, Your Honor. Jim Condo on behalf 18 19 of the defendants. 20 MR. DADIKA: Good morning, Your Honor. Greg Dadika, 21 associate general counsel for litigation for C.R. Bard. 2.2 THE COURT: All right. 23 Good morning, everybody. 24 EVERYBODY: Good morning. 25 THE COURT: Let's cover a few jury selection matters.

In the last few days we have received requests to be 1 2 excused from four jurors and I've excused three of them. 3 Juror 105 contacted us a few -- contacted the jury 4 office a few days ago and indicated that there had been a 5 death of an immediate family member and so I excused 6 Juror 105. 7 Juror 103 contacted the jury office with a doctor 8 note that she was suffering from a serious medical condition 9 that would prevent her from participating in the trial. So I went ahead and excused Juror 103. 10 11 And Juror 64 also contacted the jury office with a 12 doctor's note indicating she had been ill the last several 13 days and would be unable to participate in the trial, so I 14 excused Juror 64 for that reason. 15 So Jurors 105, 103, and 64 will not be appearing 16 today. 17 We also received this morning a note from -- well, 18 from a doctor for Juror Number 68 and I think we should ask some follow-up questions probably after we've excused the rest 19 20 of the jury panel. 21 Did you get a copy of the note regarding Juror 68? 2.2. MR. ROGERS: Yes, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: So we ought to ask some follow-up

Did you see the other documents from the other

24

25

questions.

jurors? 1 2 MR. ROGERS: Yes, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Okay. Any questions about that? 4 All right. So we'll keep Juror 68 in the process and 5 follow up on the questions about that juror when we are going 6 through the jury selection. 7 MR. O'CONNOR: Your Honor, while we're on jurors, can I raise another issue? 8 9 THE COURT: Yes. 10 MR. O'CONNOR: Going through the people who are going to be coming today, I found -- there might be more, but I 11 12 found at least two who I think we should probably ask 1.3 questions of in private. 14 And that was Juror 16. She actually answered 15 "privacy" on a couple of responses. I think the other one I believe we should consider 16 17 for a sidebar would be Juror Number 6. If you remember he has 18 a bladder stimulator issue. Rather than talking about that 19 up-front, we had raised that last time. 20 And then there is a Juror Number 44 who, again, set 21 forth "privacy" in a couple of answers on medical conditions. 2.2 And so I just wanted to bring that to the Court's attention. 23 I think it would be -- I would request that we not ask the 24 questions in front of the panel but we bring them up. 25 THE COURT: Mr. Rogers, any disagreement with that?

1 MR. ROGERS: No, Your Honor. I think that is okay. 2 And I also have got one that we may also add to the 3 list if we're going to be questioning jurors outside of the 4 presence of the entire panel. And that is Juror Number 59. 5 And, Your Honor, this gentleman indicated that he may have 6 difficulty applying the law as instructed due to an experience 7 where his sister experienced a wrongful death that they 8 attributed to her doctors. And so I think we might need to 9 follow up with him and maybe we can do that outside of the 10 presence of the rest of the panel. 11 THE COURT: Okay. All right. 12 And I will keep that list of Juror 6, 16, 68 is the 13 one we got a note on today, 44, and 59 for jurors that I'll 14 ask to remain behind when we excuse the rest of the jury 15 panel. And I will ask the question of the panel that I have 16 before, that if anybody would prefer to address an issue 17 privately, they can just tell us that and we'll add them to 18 the list of who we'll talk to after we excuse the main jury 19 panel. 20 Plaintiffs' counsel, do you have comments or 21 corrections on the voir dire questions? 2.2. MR. O'CONNOR: None from us, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: How about from defense? 24 MR. ROGERS: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: How about on the preliminary jury

25

instructions?

1.3

2.2

MR. O'CONNOR: I don't think we had any issues.

MR. ROGERS: None, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Then I'll plan to ask those voir dire questions and give the preliminary jury instructions.

Plaintiffs' counsel, do you have other matters that we ought to address before we get started this morning?

MR. LOPEZ: Yes, Your Honor. They deal with the opening statement and one of the rulings issued I think yesterday on deposition. I don't know if that's something you want to do after we pick a jury or whether you want to do it now.

THE COURT: Let's do it now.

MR. LOPEZ: I think there are two issues. Actually what I'm doing, I'm dealing with the objections that defense counsel had to two of our slides. One of them has to do with the document that you've now excluded, at least from Janet Hudnall's testimony, users can be swayed by aggressive marketing in spite of negative clinical experience, and I think the basis of that was the defendants objecting to that had something to do with failure to warn. And I think I speak for all of us, on our side we're confused about why that's a warning issue, Your Honor, because it actually is a marketing issue. And you'll recall that the defendants filed a motion,

1.3

2.2.

a motion in limine regarding marketing materials, and then they withdrew it. So that issue's still ripe in this case.

The other thing is that under the punitive damages cases in Wisconsin, the jury may consider defendants' attitude and conduct and the degree of defendants' awareness of the hazards and the successiveness. And this document is a staple for the awareness this company has for negative clinical experiences, yet they know they can still be successful marketing the product with aggressive marketing. I mean, that's — there's going to be evidence of that. We have actually someone who hasn't testified yet, Mr. Hug, who is now their national sales something. There's going to be a lot of evidence about the way they market this device.

So I just -- I -- maybe for clarification for us, I don't know why that's a warning issue. And even if it was, we wanted to take the warnings, all the things that dealt with warnings and IFU out of the case. It's the defendants' position they want to be able to tout their warnings as part of the fact that this thing's not negligently designed.

And what happens with warnings, there's a lot of case law about this, and it also deals with learned intermediary doctrine, but aggressive marketing can water down a warning. So, in other words, if you have an IFU, they're going to say doctors knew and there's an IFU, and you're marketing this thing and you're not fairly balancing it, you -- you are

1.3

2.2

keeping away from, as part of your design and marketing of the device, the fact that there's a negative clinical experience and you're weighing heavily on marketing, and that just waters down this IFU defense they have.

We just got hit with this yesterday with your order and we're concerned that's not giving us a fair opportunity to counter that part of their defense, the fact that they think — they're going to say their IFU and they've properly advised doctors and they've withdrawn their marketing materials on motion in limine. It's one of the slides we have. I don't know whether you're kicking that document out or just Mrs. Hudnall's testimony about it.

MR. LOPEZ: The other issue is that the defense —
there's a slide that deals with the Recovery migration to the
heart issue. The slide I think that follows is an HHE, and
we've adopted the language in the HHE which calls what was
happening at that time catastrophic injuries. They don't want
us to use that. They want us to use a different word. But in
the HHE, which includes both fractures with migrations to the
heart. Like what happened to Mrs. Hyde, and it also includes
the migration or embolization of the entire device into the
heart, Dr. Ciavarella uses the term "catastrophic." And
there's an issue about whether or not we can use "catastrophic
injuries reported" as it relates to the Recovery filter.

1 THE COURT: Do you have copies of these slides? 2 MR. LOPEZ: I do, Your Honor. 3 May I? 4 THE COURT: All right. Who from the defense side 5 would like to address these issues? 6 MR. LOPEZ: Then there's some issues with their slides. We'll come back after that. 7 8 THE COURT: Okay. 9 MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, we -- as Mr. Lopez informed 10 the Court, we did have objections to three of their slides. 11 And the first thing that he brought up, your docket entry 12 12598, was the docket entry that dealt with Ms. Hudnall's 13 testimony, and the testimony about this document was excluded 14 under Rule 402. And the objection was that it related to 15 failure to warn, and that objection was sustained. 16 And so, Your Honor, when we saw that this was in 17 their opening slide deck, it appeared to us that the Court was 18 inclined to exclude that evidence, and hence we objected. 19 And do you want me to continue, Your Honor, or do you 20 want to follow up? 21 THE COURT: Did you want to address the other slide? 2.2 MR. ROGERS: Yes, sir, I'll be glad to. 23 Your Honor, you've got these two slides. The first 24 one, as you can see, up at the top it's got the header 25 "catastrophic injuries reported," and there are two

descriptions of two different incidents, both of which are described as catastrophic. And then the information below them indicates that the entire filter migrated to the right atrium or to the right ventricle.

And, Your Honor, even though this particular slide does not mention the word death, we thought that it could easily be discerned from the descriptor that the filter went to the heart and that it was a catastrophic injury that it was a death so we objected to that slide. I was under the impression with the third slide we had worked that out, but I don't know if that's accurate.

MS. REED ZAIC: It is. We've withdrawn it.

MR. ROGERS: It is.

1.3

2.2.

Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okav.

By my count I've reviewed 34 depositions in the last week and a half. All of them on weekends or evenings. So I can't say with confidence that I remember my precise thinking on the Hudnall issue. But let me explain to you the line I've tried to draw. And I don't know if we can resolve this this morning or not or if we'll need more argument on it.

There is no failure-to-warn claim in the case so the jury cannot find defendant liable for a failure to warn.

The jury cannot award punitive damages for a failure to warn because the failure-to-warn claim is gone.

1.3

2.2.

When defendants argued that they should be able to put into evidence the IFU and the SIR guidelines, my initial reaction was that is a warning and shouldn't be in the case. But then as I read the Wisconsin statute and I read the Restatement, although I know there's still a question of how many of the comments of the Restatement are actually a part of Wisconsin law that we have to work through on jury instructions, I concluded that since the jury must decide whether or not the product was not reasonably safe, that is language right from the statute, it was relevant for the jury to know what users of the product had been told about risks of the product.

If I get a product and I'm not informed of a risk that it has, it may be unreasonably dangerous to me because I don't know of that risk and I'm going to fall prey to it.

But if I get a product with instructions or warnings that say here's a risk of this product so that I can assess it, deal with it, avoid it if I can, then it might not be unreasonably dangerous.

I think that's the thinking behind the comment to Restatement section 2. And I concluded that since there are risks with medical products, it was relevant for the jury to understand what doctors had been told about those risks, and patients, too, in deciding whether or not the product was not reasonably safe. That's why I let in the IFU and the SIR

1.3

2.2

guidelines -- well, that's why I let in the IFU. I let in the SIR guidelines because those guidelines talk about acceptable levels of risk for filters. Now, that's not law, but it's something that comes from the medical community that uses it, and I thought that's important perspective for a jury to have in deciding whether this product was not reasonably safe:

What does the medical community view as a reasonable level of risk with this product?

So my view was the IFU and the SIR guidelines both went to the question of whether the product was not reasonably safe. Not that it went to failure to warn. But that's why it was relevant.

I then concluded, well, if the defendants are going to be able to tell the jury, here's everything we told the jury about risks, then plaintiffs should be able to say, here's everything they didn't tell the jury about risks. And that's why I let in a lot of testimony in my deposition rulings where the question was, "Were doctors informed of this risk" or "Did you ever communicate this test result to doctors." And there's a lot of that evidence that I've admitted for exactly that reason. Because defendants are going to stand up and say this wasn't an unreasonably dangerous product because the medical community understood these risks, plaintiffs should be able to say this was unreasonably dangerous because the medical community did not

know about these risks.

2.2

That's all going to whether it's unreasonably dangerous. That's what I was trying to do when I went through the depositions.

When I saw a question and an answer that seemed to me to go to duty, namely a question of a witness, "Would you agree that a medical manufacturing company has an obligation to warn patients of everything it knows about risks," that, to me, doesn't go to whether the product is unreasonably dangerous, that goes to a duty to warn, and there is no breach of a duty to warn claim in this case. So I tried to exclude questions that I thought went to duty. Although I found it was difficult sometimes to draw the line between a question that talks about an undisclosed risk and a question that talks about a duty. But I did my best to do that.

When I came to the Hudnall questions where she was talking about a marketing technique, that seemed to me to go to the duty to warn or the failure-to-warn issue. Because it seemed to me what she was testifying about was how do we market the product? What's the pitch we make to doctors? That seemed to me to go to whether or not the warnings that were given as part of that pitch were adequate. It wasn't talking about test results or risks that weren't communicated, it was what's our marketing technique. And therefore that seemed to me to fall on the duty to warn side of the line

2.2

rather than on the unreasonably dangerous side of the line.

Now, that's my best memory of why I concluded when I came to those questions that they should be not admissible.

I'm not sure that I've drawn the line correctly. I did my best going through 34 deposition transcripts to do that.

But it may be as we go through the trial and I hear the evidence I'll conclude, no, I was too far to one side or the other on the line. But that was the rationale I was using.

Because we're seven minutes to 9:00, what I think I'd like to do on this issue is keep it under advisement. Allow the plaintiffs certainly to argue later to me that Hudnall's memo and her testimony should come in because it goes to how the product is not reasonably safe. And I'll be happy to think about it. But that was my rationale at the time that I made the decision.

So I think on the Hudnall evidence what we should do is not include it in the opening, but I'll be happy to hear further argument on why that really does go to the product defect issue that the jury's going to have to decide.

By the way, one other thing to keep in mind. I understand the arguments that this testimony and similar testimony goes to punitive damages.

My concern about that was there's lots of stuff about

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

a failure to warn that could go to punitive damages, and this is not a failure-to-warn case. So I tried again on punitive damages evidence to tie it to what is the issue in the case, product defect. And in drawing a line between what was or was not told to doctors, it seemed to me to be the same line. Namely, when they were told of risks that's relevant to unreasonable dangerousness. When they were not told of risks, that goes to it as well. And to punitive damages. And, finally, I was concerned about the law which suggests that the conduct that gives rise to punitive damages should be related to the conduct that gives rise to liability. And so if we've got a wrongful or arguably wrongful marketing technique six years before this defective product was sold, I'm not sure it satisfies that law. I say that so you can address my thinking as we argue this further, but I don't think we have time to work through all of that this morning, so --MR. LOPEZ: We do have a number --THE COURT: Let's leave Hudnall out. On the catastrophic injury issue, I didn't understand your point, Mr. Lopez, about the word catastrophic. MR. LOPEZ: We want to use it --THE COURT: I know. MR. LOPEZ: It's in the IFU and it talks about -- I'm sorry, the HHE.

```
1
               THE COURT: I heard you say that. I didn't know what
 2
      you mean by it's in the HHE.
               MR. LOPEZ: It's described in the HHE as a
 3
 4
      catastrophic injury. Plus -- and it does have the migratory
 5
      deaths. But keep in mind there were also deaths from a piece
 6
      of the metal going into the heart. That's a catastrophic
 7
      injury.
 8
               THE COURT: Mr. Rogers, do you agree that the HHE
 9
      uses the phrase "catastrophic injury"?
10
               MR. ROGERS: Yes, Your Honor, I believe it does.
               THE COURT: All right. I'm going to allow you to use
11
12
      that slide.
13
               Okay. Let's go through -- how many -- looks like you
14
      have about 15 --
15
               MR. LOPEZ: I don't know how many he's agreed to.
16
               THE COURT: Well, figure that out before you talk to
17
      me.
18
           (Counsel conferring.)
19
               THE COURT: How many are there, Mr. Lopez?
20
               MR. LOPEZ: I don't know. Probably a dozen.
               MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, I've got objections to over
21
2.2
      25 slides, so I don't know how many we're talking about this
23
     morning.
24
               THE COURT: Well, we've got four minutes. We don't
25
     have time to go through a dozen slides.
```

```
MR. LOPEZ: Could we do it before he gives his
 1
 2
      opening?
 3
               THE COURT: Well, yeah. What I want to do is -- you
 4
      really ought to be able to work out these issues. We've had
 5
      two trials. You know my rulings, you know the evidence. I'm
 6
      going to charge you with having another conference about this.
 7
      You ought to be able to work it to a lower number. But we'll
 8
      take up the ones where you really can't reach agreement after
 9
      we've picked the jury and before opening.
10
               MR. LOPEZ: All right. That's fine, Your Honor.
11
      Thank you.
12
               THE COURT: Okay.
1.3
               Defense counsel, do you have matters to discuss
14
      before we start with the jury this morning?
15
               MR. ROGERS: No, Your Honor.
               THE COURT: Okay.
16
17
               We will go ahead and have the jurors come up. We'll
18
      get them seated.
19
               Folks in the back, you're going to need to move so we
20
      can seat jurors in those three rows behind, and we'll charge
21
      into jury selection. Thank you.
2.2.
           (Recess was taken from 8:30 to 9:19. Proceedings resumed
23
      in open court with the jury panel present.)
24
               THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: MDL case 2015-2641, Bard IVC
     Filters Product Liability Litigation, jury trial for Lisa and
25
```

Mark Hyde. 1 2 Will the parties please announce. 3 MR. O'CONNOR: Good morning. Mark O'Connor for the 4 Plaintiffs, Lisa and Mark Hyde. 5 MR. LOPEZ: Good morning. Ramon Lopez also for the 6 Plaintiffs, Lisa and Mark Hyde. 7 MS. REED ZAIC: Good morning. Julia Reed Zaic for the Plaintiffs Lisa and Mark Hyde. 8 9 MR. ROGERS: Good morning. I'm Jim Rogers on behalf of Defendant C.R. Bard. 10 MS. HELM: Good morning. I'm Kate Helm on behalf of 11 12 the Defendants. 1.3 MR. CONDO: Good morning. Jim Condo on behalf of the 14 Defendants. 15 MR. DADIKA: And good morning. Greg Dadika from 16 C.R. Bard. 17 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Counsel. 18 And good morning, ladies and gentlemen who are on the 19 jury panel. Thank you all for being here this morning. 20 Our task this morning is going to be to choose a jury 21 that will consist of nine persons and that will hear and 2.2 decide this case that you've read something about in the 23 questionnaire that we sent to you. 24 And in order to accomplish that task this morning, we

are going to ask you some questions. I'll ask a few general

25

2.1

2.2.

questions at the beginning and then the lawyers may have follow-up questions for you based on your questionnaires, which we have reviewed and which will remain confidential.

And at the end of that process, which should take us to about the noon hour, we will choose a jury and excuse the rest of you. We're going to do our best to get through this as quickly as we can so those of you who are not seated on the jury will be able to get back to your lives and the business you need to take care of today.

We're going to ask you these questions in addition to the information you've provided so that we can choose the most fair and impartial jury possible to decide this case.

Please understand that the questions that are going to be asked of you are not intended to embarrass you or to pry unnecessarily into your personal affairs. Each question is designed to assist us in selecting the jury today.

Before we ask you any questions this morning, we're going to place all of you under oath. We do that to make sure we have completely accurate information when we select the jury in this case. Obviously it is very important that you answer the questions that are asked truthfully and completely. Please do not withhold any information in order to be seated on this jury. Please be straightforward in your answers rather than answering them in a way you think that I or the lawyers would expect you to answer.

1.3

2.1

2.2

When I ask you a general question at the beginning of this questioning, if your answer to the question is yes, please raise your hand and I will then ask you a few follow-up questions.

If your answer to a question is no, you don't have to do anything. We will assume that the answer was no by virtue of the fact that you did not raise your hand.

I recognize that it might be difficult for you to stand and speak in front of this large group. It's not easy to talk in front of a large group. But please recognize that all jurors are in the same situation and it is important that you answer every question to which you have relevant information.

If you would feel more comfortable responding to a particular question in a less-public setting, just tell me that and we'll wait and ask you that question after we've excused the rest of the jury panel members this morning.

When I ask you follow-up questions or when the lawyers ask you questions, they're not going to use your name, they're going to use the number that you've been assigned.

The reason we do that is because this discussion we have this morning will someday be on the public record, available to anybody who wants to view it, and we don't want your name with information you've disclosed about yourself in the public record in this day of identity theft. So we're

going to be a bit impersonal and refer to you by number, and 1 2 that way when somebody reads the transcript they'll have no 3 idea who provided the information, and that will help protect 4 your privacy. 5 All right. With that preliminary instruction, I'm 6 going to ask those of you who are on the jury panel to please 7 stand to be sworn. 8 (The jury panel was sworn.) 9 THE COURT: Okay. Please be seated. 10 (The Court and the courtroom deputy confer.) 11 THE COURT: As mentioned at the beginning, well, at 12 least the courtroom deputy mentioned it, my name is 1.3 Dave Campbell. I'm a United States District Court Judge. 14 Traci Abraham is the courtroom deputy clerk. She'll 15 be keeping us organized and on track during the trial. 16 Tricia Lyons is the court reporter. She's taking 17 down everything that is said during the trial, and there will 18 be a second court reporter helping during the trial by the 19 name of Jennifer Pancratz. 20 My law clerks are Luci Davis, Janet Howe, 21 Jeff Kilmark, and Ahmad Al Dajani. 2.2. My judicial assistant is Nancy Outley. You'll see 23 her coming in and out during the course of the trial. 24 Do any of you know me or any members of my staff on 25 any basis, social, professional, or otherwise? If so, please

```
raise your hand.
1
2
           I see no hands.
           The plaintiffs are represented by a number of attorneys.
 3
 4
           I'm going to ask you, if you would, Mr. O'Connor, to
5
      stand again.
 6
           This is Mark O'Connor from the firm of
7
      Gallagher & Kennedy. He is going to be assisted by
8
      Paul Stoller from the firm. Mr. Stoller is in the back.
9
           Plaintiffs are also represented by Ramon Lopez --
10
           If you would stand.
           -- and Josh Mankoff of the Lopez McHugh firm.
11
12
           Julia Reed Zaic and Laura Smith from the
13
      Heaviside Reed Zaic firm are also going to be involved.
14
           And Stuart Goldenberg and Marlene Goldenberg of the
15
      Goldenberg Law Firm are also going to be participating.
16
               Do any of you know these attorneys on any basis?
17
               I see no hands.
18
               Okay. Go ahead and have a seat.
19
               Mr. O'Connor, could you introduce your clients,
20
      please.
21
               MR. O'CONNOR: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
2.2.
               Lisa Hyde and Mark Hyde. Would you please stand up.
               THE COURT: All right. Do any of you know the Hydes
23
24
      on any basis?
25
               I see no hands.
```

1 Okay. Thank you. You can be seated. 2 Defendants are represented in this case by 3 James Condo from the firm of Snell & Wilmer. 4 If you would stand. 5 James Rogers, who is also standing. 6 And Matthew Lerner, Elizabeth Helm, and Richard North 7 from the firm of Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough. 8 Do any of you know these individuals on any basis? 9 All right. Mr. Rogers, could you introduce the 10 others who are with you at counsel table. MR. ROGERS: I'd be glad to, Your Honor. 11 12 With me today is Kate Helm. We're both with the law 1.3 firm of Nelson Mullins. 14 THE COURT: They actually -- she stood while you were 15 looking that way. 16 MR. ROGERS: Thank you, Your Honor. 17 With us today -- would you please stand -- is 18 Mr. Greg Dadika from C.R. Bard. 19 And, Your Honor, I also want to let the jurors know 20 that at some point Mr. Dadika will have to leave and we will 21 have another attorney here who is with C.R. Bard, and her name 2.2. is Candace Camarata. 23 THE COURT: All right. And the other gentlemen, 24 would you introduce them too. 25 MR. ROGERS: With us today, too, are Mark Gerard and

```
Mark Linder.
1
2
               THE COURT: All right. Do you know any of these
 3
      individuals on any basis?
               I see no hands.
 4
 5
               Downstairs in the jury room you should have been
6
     handed a list of witnesses who may testify in the trial. We
      don't think all of them will, but a lot of them will.
7
8
               Do any of you think you might know any of the persons
9
     who are listed on that witness list? If so, please raise your
10
     hand.
11
              Hold on just a minute, sir, we're going to bring you
12
      a mic.
13
               And if you could stand up and identify yourself by
14
     your juror number.
15
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Juror 29. It seems unlikely, but
16
     Mark Wilson. I work with someone named Mark Wilson.
17
               THE COURT: Okay. Counsel, where is the Mark Wilson
18
     witness?
19
               Sir, do you work with him here in Arizona?
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
21
               THE COURT: Is Mark Wilson from Arizona?
2.2.
               MR. ROGERS: Yes, Your Honor.
23
               Take it back. Ms. Helm is telling me he's not. He's
24
     a Bard employee.
25
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Oh. No.
```

1 THE COURT: Okay. So if he's a Bard employee, you 2 don't know him; is that correct? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's correct. 4 THE COURT: Okav. 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Juror Number 28. And also seems 6 unlikely, but I do work with a physician named John Wheeler 7 that is listed on the sheet. THE COURT: Okay. Counsel, any information? 8 9 MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, he is also a Bard employee 10 and is not a doctor. THE COURT: Okay. Thanks. That takes care of that. 11 12 Does anybody else recognize any names on the witness 13 list? 14 I see no other hands. 15 I didn't mention it, ladies and gentlemen, but I 16 will. We're going to take a break about midway through the 17 morning, probably about 10:30, for 15 minutes. Just so you 18 know we're not going to go straight through to noon. 19 We recognize, ladies and gentlemen, that jury service 20 is probably an inconvenience for you, taking you away from 21 your jobs and families and disrupting your daily routine. 2.2. Jury service is, however, one of the most important 23 duties that citizens of this country can perform. In fact, we 24 have a right to jury in the Constitution of the United States 25 just because of its importance in our justice system.

1.3

2.2.

For this reason, from time to time we ask citizens to make sacrifices and serve on juries even when inconvenient. Prospective jurors can be excused from jury service if the length of the trial or the daily schedule would impose an undue hardship. By undue hardship, I mean more than inconvenience. I mean a genuine hardship that would be experienced by you or your family.

This trial, as I think we indicated in the questionnaire, is expected to last three weeks. The specific days we are going to be in trial are the following: We're going to be in trial today, for whoever is seated on the jury, through probably 4:30 today; tomorrow, Thursday, and Friday. So the next three days of this week.

Next week we're going to start on Monday midday, about 12:30 or 1:00 because of a conflict in the morning. So we'll go Monday afternoon, and then Tuesday through Friday next week with full days.

And the week after that we will go the full week, October 1st through October 5th.

We have timed the trial. We've allocated time. We are confident we will get the trial done by October 5th.

But it will probably go up to the 4th or 5th.

The daily schedule will be to start at 9 o'clock in the morning. We will go until noon, take a one-hour break for lunch, resume at 1:00, and go until about 4:30 in the

```
afternoon, and we'll take a 15-minute break in the morning or
1
2
      the afternoon.
 3
               I know we asked you in the questionnaire whether this
 4
      would be a hardship and those of you who are here didn't
      indicate it would be or, if so, we wanted to ask follow-up
 5
 6
      questions. So my question to you now is whether this schedule
7
      or the daily duration of the trial would create an undue
8
      hardship for any of you. If so, please raise your hand.
9
               Just identify your number, if you would, sir.
                                   Number 2.
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
11
               THE COURT: Go ahead and tell us the issues.
12
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I attend college and I'm just a
1.3
      little concerned of how I'm going to keep up with the
14
      classwork for three weeks.
15
               THE COURT: Are you in college this semester?
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Yes.
17
               THE COURT: What kind of schedule do you have?
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Tuesday and Thursday I go for
19
      like 8:00 to 12:00.
20
                           Okay. How many classes are you taking?
               THE COURT:
2.1
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Two.
2.2.
               THE COURT: Is there any arrangement that can be
     made -- is that the kind of college you can listen later
23
24
      online or do you have to be in class?
25
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I currently already paid for the
```

```
semester, so I don't know how it would be refunded for that.
1
2
               THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thanks for that
 3
      information.
 4
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Juror 5. Just have a trip
 5
     planned to California at the end of the month.
 6
              THE COURT: When were you going to go?
7
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: The last week of the month.
8
              THE COURT: Of September?
9
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Of this month, yes.
10
              THE COURT: Is this a trip that can be rescheduled?
11
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, I imagine so, but there's
12
      already, like, stuff paid for for a fishing trip.
13
              THE COURT: Okay. Thanks for that information.
14
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Juror Number 28. And I have
15
      young children that will be going on fall break that last --
16
      that first week of October and it would require me to get a
17
     babysitter during that time.
18
              THE COURT: That's -- what week is that?
19
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: The first week of October.
20
              THE COURT: Okay. And is that something that could
21
     be arranged for?
2.2.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Could be arranged, but I'd prefer
     not to have to with little kids.
23
24
               THE COURT: Okay. Would it create a particular
25
     hardship for you to do that?
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It would be just an extra 1 2 financial expense that would be required. THE COURT: Okay. Thanks for that information. 3 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Juror Number 21. I'm a single 5 mother with a three-month-old child and my mother's taking 6 care of him, but I work and generally she already takes care 7 of him those days, and then having to have her take care of 8 him extra days, I cannot financially pay her more than what I 9 do. 10 THE COURT: I'm sorry, I can't hear what you're 11 saying. Can you speak a little louder. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm a single mother with a 1.3 three-month-old son and I have to take care of him. And my 14 mom already takes care of him during the week for the days 15 that I do work, and she just found out yesterday that she's 16 going to be soon getting a blood transfusion as well, so she's 17 going to have to recuperate from that, and asking her for the 18 extra time to watch my son is really hard. 19 THE COURT: Okay. Do you know when that medical 20 procedure is going to occur? 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sometime within the next few 2.2 weeks is what I've been told. 23 THE COURT: When that happens, would she be unable to 24 care for your son? 25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's just -- yeah. Basically.

1 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you for that information. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 62. 2 I just started a job 3 recently where I provide care and transportation to two 4 children with autism, and that's Monday, Wednesday, and 5 Thursdays. So I take them to school and then I pick them up. 6 And that's because nobody else can take them and pick them up. 7 THE COURT: And what are the times when you need to 8 be on that job? 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I drop them off about 8:15 in the 10 morning and then I have to pick them up around 3:15, 3:10. THE COURT: Okay. Thanks for that information. 11 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Juror Number 68. I found out 13 middle of last week that the doctors finally come to a 14 conclusion. My wife has to move out this area or lose her 15 lungs, and we're in the process of moving. I need to do that 16 immediately. 17 THE COURT: Okay. We saw --18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Letter to that effect. 19 THE COURT: Yeah. We saw the doctor's letter. It. 20 didn't have any timing in it. That was going to be our 21 follow-up question to you. How soon do you need to act on 2.2 that? 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: As soon as possible. 24 THE COURT: So that is something you're going to be 25 doing in the next few weeks?

1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Already started packing. 2 THE COURT: Okay. Thanks for that information. 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Juror 70. My personal vehicle 4 broke down on Sunday, and in order to make it up here in a 5 timely manner I had to rent a vehicle, and with the priority 6 that the mechanic has put on my vehicle, I don't know if I'll 7 be able to get it back any time soon. And I live more than 8 170 miles away. 9 THE COURT: Okay. Thanks for that information. 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Juror 106. I recently graduated college and I'm doing my job hunt right now and I have 11 12 interviews that I have to attend to, and I feel that this jury 13 duty would interfere with me finding a job opportunity. 14 THE COURT: Do you have interviews scheduled? 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I have an interview 16 scheduled on Thursday. 17 THE COURT: Okay. Is that during the workday? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 18 19 THE COURT: Okay. Thanks for that information. 20 All right. I will take that information into 21 account, ladies and gentlemen, when we are picking the jury in 2.2 this case. 23 Do any of you have any other reasons, such as a 24 physical difficulty, or a health problem or home problem that 25 would interfere with your ability to serve on this jury?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Juror Number 3. I have a hard time hearing, and just in this -- this morning when the attorneys were giving their names, I missed half their names. When this young lady and this gentleman was talking, I didn't understand a word that they said. THE COURT: We might be able to help. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. THE COURT: Try this. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: And when people talk -- besides this, if someone's talking, their back to me, I'm going to lose half the stuff they said unless they're really talking If they talk low, I will lose that conversation as well. THE COURT: Okay. We're going to have people talking into mics. Why don't you put that on right now. Goes just like that. Is that better? Can you --PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Certainly hear you now. THE COURT: Okay. We'll keep people talking in the mics and, if at any time something is happening and you can't hear, raise your hand and we'll fix it. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I will do that. THE COURT: Okay. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Juror Number 6. I do have a stimulator, a bladder stimulator. It may require a couple of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2.

23

24

25

bathroom breaks. But if we can do a break like every two and a half hours, I don't think I'd have any problem. I wanted you to be aware of that. THE COURT: Okay. We should be taking a break every hour and a half or hour and 45 minutes. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Fantastic. THE COURT: Again, if that becomes an issue, raise your hand and we'll be happy to take a break. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Juror 15. I have the same problem Juror 3 has. I have hearing aids in right now. But half the people that are talking this morning, I can't hear a word they're saying. THE COURT: Let's see if this helps. Let's try this. This is not an uncommon problem in this courtroom. We'll just wait to see if this helps. All right. Can you hear me --PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. THE COURT: Sorry, about that. That dial on the front controls volume, so you can turn it down if you need to. And if at any time you're having trouble hearing, raise your hand. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (Thumbs-up gesture) THE COURT: By the way, Jurors 3 and 16 -- or 15, I'm sorry, those batteries don't last forever. So you might hear it starting to fade. Raise your hand. As you can see, we've

```
1
      got another bunch up here and we'll give you a fresh one.
 2
               Yes, ma'am.
 3
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm Juror 31. I too, have nerve
 4
      deafness in my left ear from birth, so my right ear is very
 5
      good, I can hear, but depending on where they're sitting on my
 6
      left side, I can barely hear.
 7
               THE COURT: Why don't we try this with you as well.
 8
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
 9
               THE COURT: All right. Can you hear us there?
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Very good.
11
               THE COURT: Okay. If that becomes difficult to hear,
12
      just raise your hand.
13
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (Thumbs-up gesture)
14
               THE COURT: Any other responses?
15
               Yes, sir?
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Juror 51. I have a doctor
17
      appointment Thursday afternoon at 4 o'clock.
18
               THE COURT: Okay. Is that something that can be
19
      rescheduled?
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's for blood pressure medicine,
      so I -- they missed the appointment in the last week, so I
21
2.2.
     probably should get to it.
23
               THE COURT: Okay. Thanks for that information.
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Number 68. It's not a physical
25
      ailment, but I feel that you need to know that I've had
```

1 information from the Bard system before with my youngest son 2 and --3 THE COURT: Let me go ahead and interrupt you, 4 Juror 68. I'm going to excuse you at the end of the morning 5 so you can take care of your wife. I'll just let you know 6 that. 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Hello. I'm Number 85. I, too, 8 need a hearing device. 9 THE COURT: Okay. We've got another one. 10 How does that sound? 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (Two thumbs-up gesture) 12 THE COURT: Okay. Great. 13 Any other responses? 14 All right. One of the questions, ladies and 15 gentlemen, that I'll ask you at the end of the morning is 16 whether you know any member of the jury panel. So as folks 17 are standing, just kind of take note of them. Because we'll 18 want to know if any of you have a preexisting relationship so 19 that I can ask you some questions if you happen to know any 20 member of the jury panel. 21 My last question to you before we turn it over to the 2.2. lawyers is this: Have any of you done any research or been 23 exposed to any information about this case since you filled 24 out your jury questionnaire? If so, please raise your hand.

I see no hands.

All right. Plaintiffs' counsel, let's go ahead with 1 2 your questions. 3 MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you, Your Honor. 4 Your Honor, by the way, this is David Wenner and 5 John Campbell, who will be assisting us at this part of the 6 trial. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Say that into the mic. 8 MR. O'CONNOR: I'm sorry. David Wenner and 9 John Campbell. 10 THE COURT: Do any of you know these individuals on any basis? 11 12 I see no hands. 13 Okay. Go ahead, Mr. O'Connor. 14 MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you. 15 Again, my name is Mark O'Connor and I'm one of the 16 lawyers representing Lisa and Mark Hyde, or the plaintiffs in 17 this case. I'm going to ask you some follow-up questions on 18 what you answered in your questionnaire. And what I'd like 19 you to understand is that the intent of my questions is not to 20 cause you embarrassment. We're just trying to understand so 21 that we can understand who will be fair and impartial in this case. There may be other cases that anybody can be fair and 2.2 23 impartial, but that's the purpose of my questions, just to 24 question you and follow up on answers to your questionnaires.

So I'll start off with Number 2.

```
1
               I thought I saw that you had some fire science
 2
      training.
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's correct.
 3
 4
               MR. O'CONNOR: And did that involve training in any
 5
      type of medical care?
 6
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. I currently have my EMT.
 7
               MR. O'CONNOR: And in the course of that training,
      did you receive information about blood clots or IVC filters?
 8
 9
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. There's a chapter on blood
10
      clots.
               MR. O'CONNOR: Are you going to have any difficulty
11
12
      setting aside what you learned in those classes in this case
13
      when you hear the evidence which will involve medical
      evidence?
14
15
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't think it will be a
16
      problem.
17
               MR. O'CONNOR: I saw that in response to a question
18
      that you have a less favorable view about personal injury
19
      attorneys and a bit of a higher favorable view for medical
20
      device companies. Do you recall that answer?
2.1
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
2.2
               MR. O'CONNOR: Have you had an experience with a
23
      personal injury attorney in the past?
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                  No.
25
              MR. O'CONNOR: But do you recall that answer, is that
```

right, Number 2? 1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's correct. 2 MR. O'CONNOR: Obviously the Hydes are represented by 3 4 lawyers who are personal injury lawyers. I'm a personal 5 injury lawyer. And the other side is a medical device 6 company. Is our side starting out with you leaning slightly 7 against us as we go into this trial? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 9 MR. O'CONNOR: In other words, you felt this way long 10 before you came here, that you have less than favorable views 11 about plaintiff attorneys? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's correct. 13 THE COURT: Mr. O'Connor, let me interrupt for a 14 minute. I'm glad you asked this question because this is 15 something that I'd like all of the jurors to consider. 16 Juror Number 2, every one of us in this room have 17 life experiences or opinions that could influence a decision 18 in the case if we allowed them to and if we took them into 19 account. 20 We're going to ask jurors to set aside their personal opinions, any biases or preferences or prejudices, and not 21 2.2 consider those, but to decide this case solely on the basis of 23 the evidence and the law that they hear during the trial. 24 Do you think you would be able to do that? Or would

25

that be difficult for you to do?

1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think I could probably set 2 aside my opinions. 3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 That's the question that all of you should keep in 5 mind. Mr. O'Connor can inquire into any of them, but the 6 question at the end of the day that I'll ask, if he doesn't, 7 he probably will, is can you set aside those personal views 8 and opinions and not decide on the basis of those, but decide 9 on the basis of the facts and the evidence that you will hear. 10 And you think you could do that, Juror 2? 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I do, yes. 12 THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. O'Connor. MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you. 1.3 14 And I appreciate that, Number 2. But my question's a 15 little different just in response to your answer about 16 personal injury lawyers. Do you feel, even though you 17 certainly intend to be neutral in this case, that that feeling 18 that you have that is less than favorable about personal 19 injury attorneys could affect how you listen to evidence and 20 affect your feelings about the parties in this case? 2.1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Just going into it, I feel like 2.2. it kind of affects it, but I'm willing to be open during the case and hear both sides. 23 24 MR. O'CONNOR: All right.

You had indicated that you -- you mentioned that

you're against frivolous lawsuits. Do you recall that 1 2 response? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 4 MR. O'CONNOR: And, again, do you feel that simply 5 because a party has brought a claim into court that it's 6 frivolous? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 8 MR. O'CONNOR: When you talk about frivolous 9 lawsuits, can you tell me what you mean? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Just I've seen a lot of lawsuits 10 11 that I feel like people are just trying to get money for. 12 They don't really have cause for why they're trying to 13 actually get the money. 14 MR. O'CONNOR: All right. Well, this is going to be 15 a case where the plaintiffs are going to be requesting an 16 award that will involve money damages. Is that difficult for 17 you to sit down and listen and hear and deliberate on a case 18 where money damages are going to be asked for? 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, it would. 20 MR. O'CONNOR: It will be difficult? 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 2.2. MR. O'CONNOR: And do you think, knowing that this is 23 a case that involves money damages that, again, that we, the 24 plaintiffs -- you're starting leaning against us, knowing that 25 about our part of the case?

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's correct.
 1
 2
               MR. O'CONNOR: And will that affect your ability to
 3
      be less than neutral when considering the case of Mr. and
 4
     Mrs Hyde?
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It could potentially be.
 6
      again, I'm willing to listen to both sides during the trial.
 7
               MR. O'CONNOR: But in fairness, as you said, starting
 8
      right now, your feelings, you're leaning against our side, the
 9
     plaintiff side. Is that fair?
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
11
               MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you.
12
               Number 3.
13
               Can you hear me okay?
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I can hear you fine.
15
              MR. O'CONNOR: Thanks. And thank you for coming
16
      today.
17
               I think you said that you believe that there should
18
     be legislative limitations or caps on damages in response to
19
      your questionnaire.
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I do.
21
               MR. O'CONNOR: And is that a feeling and opinion you
2.2
      developed before you ever came to this courtroom?
23
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
24
               MR. O'CONNOR: You felt, I thought, that you feel
25
     there's extreme awards out there.
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Definitely, yes.

2.2.

MR. O'CONNOR: Does that mean in your mind, sir, that you think that no matter what the case is that there should be a limitation on how much people should be able to recover?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think it should be -- like I say, not frivolous. Can I give an example?

MR. O'CONNOR: Sure. Please.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I read the paper, I watch the news, I watch a lot of television, and you see sometimes cases people are given 4-, 5-, \$600 million, 30-, 40 million, in my opinion that they'll never collect on that from the company because I think they'll appeal and it will go on and it's not helping those people.

I think if the award is within a reasonable amount, not an excessive amount, the people that are suing and if they win the case they can get their money quicker and go on with their lives.

MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you. I appreciate that, sir.

Now, at the end of this case, the lawyers that represent the plaintiffs, we will be asking for an award that we believe is fair. But is it conceivable that we may ask for an amount that we believe is fair but you may, because of your feelings that you brought here to court, feel that that is just too high and despite what the law is, you could not award that?

```
1
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have to hear the case, to be
 2
      perfectly honest. You have to hear what it is. Yeah, if it's
 3
      an excessive award I may not necessarily vote against the
 4
      plaintiff or whatever, but I would take that into
 5
      consideration of -- like I said, I have to hear the case. If
 6
      it's negligence or however you want to put it, then I may
 7
      consider it, but extreme or excessive awards, I don't believe
 8
      in.
 9
               MR. O'CONNOR: Knowing that we are on the plaintiff
10
      side, the side that is claiming damages in this case, are we
      starting out in sort of an uphill climb with you?
11
12
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't believe you are. No.
                                                                  Ι
1.3
      can be objective on this.
14
               MR. O'CONNOR: All right. Is there any feeling that
15
      you may be leaning against us --
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
17
               MR. O'CONNOR: -- or being suspicious because we are
18
      going to be asking for damages?
19
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. None whatsoever.
20
               MR. O'CONNOR: All right. Thank you. Appreciate
2.1
      that.
2.2.
               Juror Number 6. How are you, sir? Thank you for
23
      coming down here today.
24
               I thought I read in your answers that you have very
25
      strong feelings in favor of corporations. Did I read that
```

correctly? 1 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't think so. 3 MR. O'CONNOR: In terms of -- you, I think, told us 4 before that you have received -- have you received a medical 5 device? 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. It's Medtronics. It's a 7 small computer about the size of a pack of cigarettes. It's a 8 bladder stimulator, and it's inserted into my lower back. 9 MR. O'CONNOR: Does your experience with your medical 10 device, does that affect your ability to hear a case involving a medical device? 11 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, not at all. 13 MR. O'CONNOR: Do you have a more favorable view of a 14 medical device company such as Bard, who is a party in this 15 case? 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't think so at all. 17 MR. O'CONNOR: Is there anything that you think of 18 that is going to affect your ability in this case to be fair 19 and impartial? 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I think I'd be fair and 21 impartial. 2.2 MR. O'CONNOR: And I don't want to get too far about 23 the things you told us before. Is there anything that you 24 feel about your condition that may cause you to be distracted 25 or not be able to give us your full attention?

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't think so. As long as we
 1
 2
      had a break every two hours, two and a half hours.
 3
               MR. O'CONNOR: We need those too.
 4
               Thank you.
 5
               THE COURT:
                           Thank you, Juror 6.
 6
               MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you, sir.
 7
               Number 16. Good morning.
 8
               And thank you. Thank you for completing your
 9
      questionnaire and for being forthright with us and understand,
10
      again, that my questions are just to follow up with you on
11
      your feelings.
12
               You have strong feelings against plaintiff --
13
      personal injury attorneys; is that correct?
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
15
               MR. O'CONNOR: And it sounds as though that is
16
      something that you've carried with you and --
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: For the last 30 years. I worked
      in the emergency room for ten, 15 years.
18
19
               MR. O'CONNOR: I also saw that you have concerns
20
      about frivolous lawsuits.
21
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Who?
2.2.
               MR. O'CONNOR: Did you talk about in your answer
23
      about greedy attorneys that you feel personal injury --
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I didn't -- everything on the
25
      survey was personal.
```

MR. O'CONNOR: Okay. But you understand that the 1 2 plaintiffs in this case, Lisa Hyde and Mark Hyde, they're 3 represented by lawyers, us, and we're personal injury lawyers? 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sure. I have nothing against 5 personal injury lawyers, but in cases where it matters. But 6 it's -- not matters, but -- I'm strongly pro medical devices 7 because that's what helps thousands and thousands and millions 8 of people to go on with their lives. Every day you get in the 9 car, you don't know whether you get out of it. And yet you 10 get in the car anyway. You know, everything that is there when you get behind the wheel and you get anywhere because 11 12 you're hoping you're going to get to the different 1.3 destination. 14 The same thing with medical devices. That's my 15 opinion, though. You're trying to improve your life. You're 16 trying to live longer. They develop those devices, but not 17 everything can be perfect in this world. So, yes --18 MR. O'CONNOR: So as you started this case, you have 19 strong feelings in favor of medical device companies. 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. They prolong our lives and 2.1 they help us every single day of our lives. People live 2.2 longer. And if this person is alive and well, there is no point to this case, in my opinion. 23 24 MR. O'CONNOR: And you also felt there's too many

lawsuits being filed? Did I understand your answer correctly?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

17

18

20

2.1

2.2.

23

24

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I didn't -- no. See, everybody
     makes mistakes. It depends, of course, on the mistake,
     whether it's worth to be sued, but against the company who is
     trying to improve our lives, who is trying to make us function
     more, who's trying to keep us with our families longer, I
     don't see why it needs to be done.
              MR. O'CONNOR: All right. Is it fair to say that
     right now, as you sit here, based upon the feelings that
     you've developed long before you came here that --
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 30 years ago.
              MR. O'CONNOR: -- you will favor the medical device
     company in this case?
13
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
              MR. O'CONNOR: And is it also fair that the party
15
     here, the plaintiffs that brought the claim against the
16
     medical device, you're leaning and have feelings that you
     can't be as neutral with that party as you can --
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. I won't be neutral. I
     cannot be.
19
              MR. O'CONNOR: So you cannot be fair and impartial.
     Is that fair?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
              MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you. I appreciate that.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: You're welcome.
              MR. O'CONNOR: Number 20.
```

```
1
               You answered some questions about your grandmother.
2
      Do you recall that?
 3
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.
 4
               MR. O'CONNOR: Is that something that you would
 5
      rather talk about privately?
 6
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I'm open to talk about it.
7
               MR. O'CONNOR: I thought you said that your
8
      grandmother received an IVC filter.
9
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: She has, yes. She had.
               MR. O'CONNOR: And I'm sorry about your loss.
10
11
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   Thank you.
12
               MR. O'CONNOR: Do you know the company that made that
13
      TVC filter?
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I do not.
15
               MR. O'CONNOR: But my reading of your questionnaire
16
      is that you feel strongly in favor of medical device companies
17
      that make filters because of your grandmother's experience.
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's correct.
19
               MR. O'CONNOR: And is it fair to say that that
20
      feeling is something that you bring here to court today?
2.1
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
2.2.
               MR. O'CONNOR: Do you think that knowing that there's
23
      a plaintiff, the plaintiffs here are bringing a claim against
      a medical device company, that as we're starting out you feel
24
25
      strongly in favor of the medical device company compared to
```

1 the party bringing the lawsuit? 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I do, just because I've had a 3 first-hand experience with the exact product we're talking 4 about. 5 MR. O'CONNOR: And that's fair, and I appreciate 6 that, and it sounds like what you're saying is you can't set 7 that experience aside when you hear evidence in this case. 8 that fair? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's fair. It's difficult. 9 10 MR. O'CONNOR: And it sounds that you just -- as much 11 as you'd like to, you can't be neutral in this case? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It would be difficult for me. 1.3 MR. O'CONNOR: So while certainly there's other cases 14 you can be fair and impartial, is it fair to say that this is 15 one that you cannot be fair and impartial? 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I would agree with that just 17 because of the specific product that I've actually, you know, had experience with. 18 MR. O'CONNOR: I appreciate your answer. Thank you. 19 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you. MR. O'CONNOR: Number 21. 2.1 2.2. I just have a couple questions for you. 23 I noticed, looking at your responses to the 24 questionnaire, and I appreciate you being forthright, but I 25 thought you said in a question about whether you could be a

fair and impartial juror you just didn't understand the 1 2 dynamics of this lawsuit. Do you recall that answer? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 4 MR. O'CONNOR: Could you explain what you meant? 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I've never personally had an 6 experience with anyone in my family or friends that have had any filters or any devices put in them so I don't -- I never 7 8 really researched it and I don't fully understand some things 9 that they're there for or what they exactly do. 10 MR. O'CONNOR: There's going to be evidence in this case that will explain a lot about filters and lot about blood 11 12 disorders. Are you able to listen to that evidence? 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 14 MR. O'CONNOR: And sounds as though that whatever you 15 answered in your questionnaire, that you feel that you can be 16 fair and impartial in this case? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. If it's really explained and I can understand it, then yes. 18 19 MR. O'CONNOR: Is there anything that you saw when 20 you read the questionnaire that you thought that bothers you or thought that, you know, I wonder, I don't know that I can 21 2.2. set aside my feelings in this case? 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 24 MR. O'CONNOR: Okay. Thank you. 25 Number 22.

```
You live in Globe?
 1
 2
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I do.
 3
               MR. O'CONNOR: I used to drive back and forth.
 4
      That's a long drive.
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, it is.
 6
               MR. O'CONNOR: How long is it?
 7
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: To here, it's about an hour and a
 8
      half. But I stayed at a hotel last night.
 9
               MR. O'CONNOR: All right. If you're selected to be
10
      on this case, is that drive back and forth going to be a
11
      hardship for you?
12
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I'll be staying in a hotel
1.3
      here.
14
               MR. O'CONNOR: All right. Now, I saw you worked --
15
      did I read that correctly, you work in HR?
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir, I'm an HR director.
17
               MR. O'CONNOR: And I also thought that I saw in your
18
      response that you have some responsibility for risk management
19
      administration.
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. It's mainly the
21
      property and casualty, but I also oversee the employee
2.2.
     benefits.
23
               MR. O'CONNOR: When you say property and casualty, do
24
     you get involved in claims, injury claims?
25
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It is more my risk management
```

2.2

associate. I have a staff, and then it goes to that insurance company, and then they give us their decisions. I don't get very involved in the claims.

MR. O'CONNOR: But do you have any involvement in claims against the county? You work for the county; is that correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct. I do work for Gila County. Only what claims get sent to our insurer.

MR. O'CONNOR: And your experience, just to what extent it is, being involved in claims and knowing that people have brought claims for all sorts of cases against the county, how does that affect you? Does that affect you coming to a case where there's going to be a claim for injuries against the medical device company?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I don't believe so. I feel that my job, I'm kind of the liaison between the management of the county and the employees, and my job is to protect both. So I, actually on a daily basis, make decisions, but they're all decided on evidence, witnesses, documentation. Anything outside of that is just hearsay. I have to make sure I have the facts.

MR. O'CONNOR: All right. So do you actually get involved in the evaluation of claims and evidence to support or not support claims?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not very often. If it goes to

the level of needing to be -- our county attorney would step 1 2 I would not be involved. Very rarely am I involved in 3 anything like that. 4 MR. O'CONNOR: Is there anything about those 5 experiences in handling claims that you feel you may not be 6 able to set aside in hearing the evidence in this case? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Oh, no. No. Not at all. 8 MR. O'CONNOR: You did -- I thought you indicated 9 there there's too many lawsuits. 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm sorry? MR. O'CONNOR: I thought you indicated that you feel 11 12 there's too many lawsuits. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I probably, like the juror behind 1.3 14 me, just frivolous ones where, you know, I order hot coffee 15 and I spill it on my leg and now I'm going to sue somebody 16 because it was hot. I mean, that's the type of thing I mean. 17 I knew it was hot. 18 MR. O'CONNOR: I understand. Well, there's no hot 19 coffee in this --20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I don't. MR. O'CONNOR: Is there something about that feeling, 21 too many lawsuits, that you think it may cause you to be 2.2. 23 suspicious or have questions as you get in and you hear this 24 case that it may suddenly dawn on you, you just feel you can't

be fair?

```
1
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir. Like I said, even in my
 2
      own job, until I have evidence and until I've listened to
 3
      witnesses, I have no view one way -- I try to be very neutral
 4
      until I have all of the evidence before me. It's imperative
 5
      to my job.
 6
               MR. O'CONNOR: All right. Thank you.
 7
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you.
 8
               MR. O'CONNOR: And Number 23.
 9
               How are you?
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning.
11
               MR. O'CONNOR: Did I read correctly that you're a PE
12
      teacher?
1.3
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I am.
14
              MR. O'CONNOR: Is your husband a firefighter?
15
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, he is.
16
               MR. O'CONNOR: And does he talk to you about being
      out there in his job and what he sees out there?
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He does.
18
19
               MR. O'CONNOR: Anything about what your husband does
20
      or what you do that you feel may affect your ability to be
2.1
      neutral or not so neutral in a case where we have a party
2.2.
      that's bringing a claim for damages against a medical device
23
      company?
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I would be very neutral.
25
              MR. O'CONNOR: You've had -- you sat on two juries
```

```
before.
 1
 2
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I have.
 3
               MR. O'CONNOR: Were you the foreperson?
 4
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   I was not.
 5
               MR. O'CONNOR: One, I think, was in district court in
 6
      this building?
 7
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, in the early '90s.
 8
               MR. O'CONNOR: What type of case was that?
 9
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It was a criminal case.
10
               MR. O'CONNOR: Are you able to tell us the results of
      that?
11
12
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It was -- the guy had committed a
13
      murder, but on the Arizona side he had lied on the application
14
      for a gun and was in possession of and -- and things of those
15
      sorts.
16
               MR. O'CONNOR: And what was the outcome?
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He was found guilty.
18
               MR. O'CONNOR: And then your other case, was that a
19
      civil case?
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It was a civil case.
20
2.1
               MR. O'CONNOR: And was that in a superior court?
2.2.
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Arizona court.
23
               MR. O'CONNOR: And what type of case was that?
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It was a Tempe businessman and a
25
      sporting goods company in the midwest.
```

MR. O'CONNOR: Was it a contract or did it involve 1 2 injuries at all? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It did not involve injuries. It 4 was all based on boat motors. 5 MR. O'CONNOR: I think you said your experience on 6 both of those was favorable? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. MR. O'CONNOR: Now, and again, if this is something 8 9 that you're not comfortable talking about, please let me know, but I saw that your dad, your father had issues with deep vein 10 11 thrombosis. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, he had. 1.3 MR. O'CONNOR: And do you know how he was treated? 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: His was all treated with medication. 15 16 MR. O'CONNOR: Okay. Knowing this is going to 17 involve medical testimony on issues that relate to DVTs and 18 filters, is there anything about your dad or your experience 19 with your father that would affect your ability to be fair and 20 impartial? 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not at all. Not at all. 2.2 MR. O'CONNOR: All right. Thank you. I appreciate 23 that. 24 THE COURT: Counsel, could you approach for just a 25 minute.

1 Ladies and gentlemen, if you want to stand up for a 2 minute while we talk, but don't go anywhere. But feel free to 3 stand up for just a minute. 4 (Bench conference as follows:) 5 THE COURT: I wanted to point out you've taken 25 6 minutes to cover 12 jurors. And by my calculation, at this 7 rate you will have more than two hours of questioning. I know 8 you need to cover what you need to cover, but I think we need 9 to pick up the pace. Otherwise we're not going to be through 10 jury selection until 4 o'clock. 11 MR. O'CONNOR: I'll move along. 12 THE COURT: Okay. Thanks. 13 (Bench conference concludes.) 14 THE COURT: Thank you all. 15 MR. O'CONNOR: Number 25. I thought I read in your questionnaire you don't want 16 17 to sit as a juror. Did I read that correctly? 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 19 MR. O'CONNOR: And why is that? 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I've never been a juror before. 2.1 MR. O'CONNOR: Is it something that you feel you 2.2. would prefer not to do in this case, is to be here for three weeks listening to this case? 23 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 25 MR. O'CONNOR: And do you think that knowing that you

```
don't want to be here could affect your ability to be fair and
1
2
      impartial?
 3
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Probably not. No.
 4
               MR. O'CONNOR: But you would prefer not to be here?
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right.
 6
               MR. O'CONNOR: All right. Thank you.
7
               Number 28.
8
               Do you work in a health care profession?
9
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                   I do.
10
               MR. O'CONNOR: And I thought you said you know
11
      somebody who works for Bard.
12
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I do.
13
              MR. O'CONNOR: And what does that person do?
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: She's a sales rep that brings in
     products. I work in a operating room as a nurse. She brings
15
16
      in products to our operating room.
17
               MR. O'CONNOR: Okay. And is she somebody you deal
18
     with on a regular basis?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's correct.
19
20
              MR. O'CONNOR: Can you tell us her name?
2.1
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Her name is Andrea Urlaub.
2.2.
               MR. O'CONNOR: And knowing that this is a case
23
      against Bard -- are you friends with her?
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I mean, not like we've ever gone
25
     anywhere together. Just acquaintances, I would say.
```

MR. O'CONNOR: Do you think it will be difficult for 1 2 you knowing that she works for the company, Bard, who is also 3 a defendant in this case? Do you think it would be difficult 4 for you to find against Bard and have to go back and see her 5 at work sometime? 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I don't. 7 MR. O'CONNOR: All right. You're in nursing. 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct. 9 MR. O'CONNOR: You've had a lot of experience in 10 medical and nursing issues. 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Um-hmm. 12 MR. O'CONNOR: How are you going to -- are you going 1.3 to be able to set those -- what you've learned in your 14 experience aside in listening to the evidence in this case? 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I believe I would be able to. 16 MR. O'CONNOR: Thanks. 17 Number 29. 18 It looked as though that you have stronger better --19 more favorable feelings for medical device companies than you 20 do for personal injury lawyers. Do I read that correctly? 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I can imagine that I would have 2.2 written that. I mean, in filling out the questionnaire. But, 23 I mean, if we listen to what has -- the questions you've asked 24 already, I don't have any problem being impartial in this

25

case.

MR. O'CONNOR: All right. Thanks. 1 2 And Number 30. 3 You feel that there's too many lawsuits and that 4 money damages awards have been too high. Did I read your 5 answers correctly? 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 7 MR. O'CONNOR: And I think you also feel that there 8 should be legislative caps, reforms, limitations on the amount 9 of damages that people should ask for. 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 11 MR. O'CONNOR: That, to me, seems like that was a 12 strong feeling that you had long before you came here today. 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sure. 14 MR. O'CONNOR: Knowing that and the way you feel, do 15 you have limitations in your mind that anything above that is 16 just too much? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: For this particular case, no, 18 because I don't know anything about it. I just think if 19 you -- anybody who looks at the internet, reads something 20 on -- you know, newspaper, reads -- sees the news, there are cases that make you go how did a jury ever come up with that 21 2.2 number. It just doesn't seem like a reasonable outcome. So I 23 don't think it would affect a specific case. I mean, I just 24 think -- I don't know, life situations. You come up with

25

opinions.

```
1
               MR. O'CONNOR: But in this case we have a party, the
2
     plaintiffs are going to be asking for money damages. Does
     that concern you or cause you to be more suspicious of them
 3
 4
     before we even start?
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not at all.
 6
               MR. O'CONNOR: Do you think there's anything about
7
     your feelings about the need for limitations on damages that
      would affect your ability to be fair and impartial here?
8
9
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
10
               MR. O'CONNOR: Okay. Thank you.
               Number 32.
11
12
               Just the question -- I see you're from Payson.
1.3
      You're going to be traveling quite a distance every day. Will
14
      that cause you any difficulty?
15
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'll be staying at a hotel.
16
               MR. O'CONNOR: Pardon me?
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'll be staying at a hotel.
18
               MR. O'CONNOR: So you don't see that travel's going
     to impose any problem for you?
19
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
2.1
               MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you.
2.2.
               Number 46.
               Good morning. Thank you for coming.
23
24
               You had indicated that you felt that you would not be
25
     able to be fair and impartial because of what you called your
```

concern about unscrupulous companies and greedy individuals. 1 2 Did I read your answers correctly? 3 THE COURT: Sir, can you hold the mic up closer. 4 Thank you. 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Really depends. I've seen cases 6 on both sides. I've seen -- I've heard -- I've heard cases 7 like spilling coffee on one side and of course pop culture 8 movies like Rainmaker. There are -- there are those cases on 9 both sides. That's what my feeling. 10 MR. O'CONNOR: Well, right now as you sit here today, do you feel you can be neutral, listen to the evidence? 11 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I do. But I have to mention that 1.3 I -- I was a brought up --14 THE COURT: Pardon me, sir, could you --15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: -- you know, in a different 16 culture. So in a country that was entirely different system, 17 a communist country where the system works entirely 18 differently. So I've been living in this country for over 20, 19 30 years. I have tried -- I'm sure I have adapted to the 20 cultures in this country, but I'm afraid that subconsciously 21 I'm not sure whether those values that was deep inside me 2.2 would come up. So I don't know. 23 MR. O'CONNOR: Well, I appreciate that. And it 24 sounds like you recognize there's differences from the 25 experience where you grew up and where you live now; is that

1 right? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. Correct. 2 3 MR. O'CONNOR: Do you think just with your background 4 and your experience in the country where you were born and 5 raised that it will be hard to set aside your life and what 6 you've learned and that culture, it would be difficult for you 7 to set that aside in listening to a case here where a party, 8 if proven, is allowed to recover damages from a party who is 9 proven to be at fault? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I wouldn't say it's difficult, but it's something I have to be very conscious of all the 11 12 time. In the culture where I grew up, if you are found guilty 13 and even if you are sentenced to death, there are very few 14 people that would repeal the court, the ruling. This is the 15 case even today. So those are the -- this was the atmosphere 16 where I was brought up. I'm conscious that this is not our 17 value, so I'm just conscious of the differences. 18 MR. O'CONNOR: And you understand this is a civil case not a criminal case? 19 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I understand. 2.1 MR. O'CONNOR: All right. Thank you. 2.2. Number 50. 23 Good morning. 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Morning. 25 MR. O'CONNOR: I think I saw where you answered that

you have very strong feelings in favor of medical device 1 2 companies. Did I read that correctly? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 4 MR. O'CONNOR: And that's something -- that's a 5 belief and a feeling that you brought to this court that you 6 developed long before you came here. Fair? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 8 MR. O'CONNOR: And you also indicated that you have 9 difficulties because you feel that most lawsuits are brought 10 against big companies or people of wealth. Did I read that 11 correctly? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 13 MR. O'CONNOR: And it sounds as though that's 14 something you're concerned about when you hear about any type 15 of a civil lawsuit. 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct. 17 MR. O'CONNOR: And something that you just can't set 18 aside no matter what the evidence would be in a case like 19 this. Is that fair? 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I don't think so. I think I would be able to -- they're all individual cases. 21 2.2. MR. O'CONNOR: Knowing that there's a case that is 23 brought against a medical device company, do you feel, though, 24 your feelings strongly in favor of that, of a medical device 25 company, that that will affect your ability as you start this

In other words, the party suing the medical device 1 2 company is starting with you leaning somewhat against us? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 4 MR. O'CONNOR: Is there anything about your feelings 5 about awards being too high that you feel would affect your 6 ability to listen to the evidence in this case? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. MR. O'CONNOR: You support legislative reform caps on 8 9 damages? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: MR. O'CONNOR: I thought I read that you felt that 11 12 the judicial system should not be used for people to get money 13 for retirement. Did I read that correctly? 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not necessarily just retirement, 15 but just in general. 16 MR. O'CONNOR: And again, that's a feeling that you 17 developed long before you came here? 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely. 19 MR. O'CONNOR: And does that mean, though, that you 20 have concerns or questions or suspicions about people who are 21 going to request money damages in a lawsuit? 2.2. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, because I haven't heard the 23 case yet. 24 MR. O'CONNOR: Are there any type of damages you 25 think you just simply don't believe should be recovered, such

as pain and suffering? 1 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 3 MR. O'CONNOR: All right. Anything about your 4 answers, about your life experiences that you think will 5 affect your ability to be neutral or fair and impartial in 6 this case? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't think so. 8 MR. O'CONNOR: Okay. Thank you, sir. Appreciate 9 that. Number 51. 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning. 11 12 MR. O'CONNOR: Good morning. Thank you for coming. 13 You, too, sir, I thought I saw that you feel that 14 there are too many lawsuits and the awards are too high. 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I may have answered it that way 16 on the questionnaire, but they're all different. 17 MR. O'CONNOR: I thought I read that you support 18 legislative reform for caps on damages? 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I probably in general would agree 20 with that statement, yes. MR. O'CONNOR: Do you have a limit in mind where you 21 think anything above that is just too much, no matter what the 2.2 23 evidence showed? 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Despite what I think, every case 25 is different.

```
MR. O'CONNOR: Now, it's possible that the plaintiffs
1
2
      in this case may ask this jury to award an amount of money
 3
      that we believe is fair. Is there a risk or a chance that
 4
      that amount that we're asking for, you may feel that, no, I've
 5
      got to go back to my feeling I think that limitations should
 6
     be imposed in this case?
7
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think I can get past any
8
     personal bias.
9
               MR. O'CONNOR: Right. Do you have personal bias
10
      against money damages as you start out?
11
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
12
               MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you.
1.3
              Number 52.
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
15
               MR. O'CONNOR: You have less than favorable views for
16
     personal injury attorneys in response to your questionnaire.
17
     Do you recall that?
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That sounds correct.
19
               MR. O'CONNOR: And obviously the Hydes are
20
      represented by personal injury lawyers. Does that mean that
2.1
      in your mind that you're already leaning against this side
2.2.
      compared to the medical device company?
23
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think it would be the burden of
24
     proof might be higher on you with my prejudices.
25
               MR. O'CONNOR: So you would, just because of your
```

```
1
      feeling, would hold us --
2
               THE COURT: Excuse me, Mr. O'Connor. Mr. O'Connor,
      could you just hold that mic up a little closer.
 3
 4
               MR. O'CONNOR: Okay.
 5
               THE COURT: Thank you.
 6
               MR. O'CONNOR: I think you said that you feel you
7
     would probably hold to us a higher burden.
8
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I think that's correct.
9
               MR. O'CONNOR: Meaning we're starting behind or
10
     you're leaning against us at the start.
11
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think so. I mean, I would make
12
     every attempt to be impartial.
1.3
               MR. O'CONNOR: But as you sit here today, you just
14
     don't know if you can be fair and impartial.
15
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
16
               MR. O'CONNOR: Is that correct?
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, that's correct.
18
               MR. O'CONNOR: All right. Thank you.
19
               Number 68.
20
               I'm sorry, sir. I don't need to talk to you.
21
      you. I would love to but I don't need to right now.
2.2.
               Your Honor, may I take a moment to consult --
23
               THE COURT: Yeah.
24
               Actually, why don't we go ahead and take a break.
25
     But before you stand up and walk out, ladies and gentlemen,
```

let me mention a couple of things to you. 1 2 First, please don't talk to each other or anybody 3 else about this case during the break. That's an instruction I'm going to give the jury from now until the end of trial so 4 5 that you're not influenced by other views that you might hear. 6 Second, please put that sheet with the number on it 7 that you have on your seat so that when you come back in you 8 sit in the same place. 9 As you go out the doors, there are bathrooms on this 10 floor in both directions and on the two floors below. 11 We apologize for the heat in the atrium outside. You 12 can talk to the architect about that. 13 And we will resume at quarter to 11:00. 10:45. 14 you could be back in your seats by then, we would appreciate 15 it. 16 Thank you all. 17 (Recess taken from 10:29 to 10:44. Proceedings resumed 18 in open court with the jury panel present.) 19 THE COURT: Please be seated. 20 Counsel, approach just a minute, please. 2.1 (Bench conference as follows:) 2.2. THE COURT: Counsel, I understand Juror Number 68 was 23 trying to assertively speak with counsel during the break. 24 He's the guy we're going to excuse because of his wife's 25 illness. I think we just ought to go ahead and excuse him

1 now. 2 MR. ROGERS: Mark, you look like you don't know 3 what's going on. 4 MS. HELM: Julia -- he tried to engage in a 5 conversation. And I was present, I saw her cut it off. 6 THE COURT REPORTER: Counsel, I can't hear. 7 THE COURT: Right. So my thought is I won't do it at 8 this moment because I don't want him to think we've been up 9 here talking about him, but in five or ten minutes I'll look 10 at the clock and say we'll excuse you, Juror 68. 11 MR. O'CONNOR: That's fine. 12 Let me give you an update. I have two quick 13 follow-ups and then I'm done. 28 and 29 for two follow-ups 14 that I missed. 15 THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. (Bench conference concludes.) 16 17 THE COURT: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. We will 18 continue. 19 MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you. I'm almost done here. 20 Number 29, I apologize, I just wanted to follow up on 21 one area with you. 2.2 And, again, I just want to ask about questions you 23 answered about your family members, and if it's something you 24 feel you can't talk to in open court, let me know, but --25 PROSPECTIVE PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.

```
MR. O'CONNOR: -- my question was it sounds as though
 1
 2
      there were family members, I think your dad, had issues with
 3
      DVTs. Did we read that correctly?
 4
               PROSPECTIVE PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. He had a
 5
      blood -- he had a blood clot.
 6
               MR. O'CONNOR: Was he treated with any type of
      filter?
 7
 8
               PROSPECTIVE PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, not that I'm
 9
      aware of. I think it was only medication.
10
               MR. O'CONNOR: All right. Thanks. That's all I had.
11
               PROSPECTIVE PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
12
               MR. O'CONNOR: And then Number 28. I had follow-up
13
      with you. And, again, thank you.
14
               Just going back to Bard filters, you're in the
15
      operating room, I believe; is that correct?
16
               PROSPECTIVE PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's correct.
17
               MR. O'CONNOR: And you probably have been involved
18
      with filters in your practice as a nurse.
19
               PROSPECTIVE PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, as just a floor
20
      nurse when I was working at the heart hospital next door to
2.1
      the current hospital where I work, but in my operating room
      right now we don't do any cardiac things, so I don't have any
2.2.
23
      current working with filters.
24
               MR. O'CONNOR: Do you feel that you have a favorable
25
      impression of Bard products, medical devices?
```

PROSPECTIVE PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I do not. 1 2 MR. O'CONNOR: And so the relationship you have with 3 that sales rep, does that affect you at all in how you feel 4 about one company that makes products versus another? PROSPECTIVE PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It does not. 5 MR. O'CONNOR: All right. Thank you. 6 7 That's all, Your Honor. Thank you. 8 THE COURT: Okay. Thanks. 9 Defense counsel, your questions. 10 MR. ROGERS: Thank you, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: As Mr. Rogers is walking up, Juror 68, 12 I'm thinking of you packing up. We'll go ahead and excuse you 1.3 There's no point having you remain the rest of the 14 morning. Why don't we go ahead and let you go. And best of 15 luck to your wife. 16 PROSPECTIVE PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you. 17 THE COURT: Mr. Rogers, you may proceed. 18 MR. ROGERS: Thank you, Your Honor. 19 Can everybody hear me okay? Can everybody in the 20 back hear me okay? 21 All right. Thank you. 2.2. I'm going to try to be fairly brief, but Juror Number 4, I'd like to start with you, please. 23 I'd like to understand, if it's okay with you, a 24 25 little bit more about what you do. And let me ask you first

of all -- and I'm sorry, I didn't mean to cut you off -- but I 1 2 wasn't clear what the name of the company was that you work 3 for. Can you explain that to us. 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I currently work with IQVIA. 5 actually a clinical research associate. One of my clients --6 my company's clients is Amgen Pharmaceutical, so we make drugs -- Amgen Pharmaceutical make drugs. So I'm a clinical 7 8 research associate. I go to different locations where they're 9 having studies, clinical trials, and I make sure that the 10 study sites are adhering to protocol and they don't deviate from the protocol. I have a protocol division and have to 11 12 report to IRB, which is Institutional Review Board. I also 13 make sure the subjects are given the right drugs and that the 14 site is approved to conduct the trial. 15 MR. ROGERS: And so you are involved in multiple 16 different sites; is that correct? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, every week I go to different 18 location. 19 MR. ROGERS: And as part of that, it sounds like 20 maybe you have sort of an inspection function, would that be accurate, to make sure everything is being done appropriately? 21 2.2. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, according to the protocol. 23 MR. ROGERS: And I believe from your background you 24 have a master's in business; is that correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. I also just completed my

masters in clinical research last month.

2.2.

MR. ROGERS: Let me ask you specifically, and I may have misread what you wrote, but I believe you put on your questionnaire that you are a CRA monitor. Is that accurate?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. Yes. It can be used interchangeably. You can say clinical research associate or you can say a monitor. It's the same thing.

MR. ROGERS: So when you say monitor, can you explain what you mean by that term.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Again, as a monitor I go to different locations where they're having clinical trials, I make sure that the -- we refer to the patient as subjects. We don't know them by name. My job is to make sure that the site is adherent to protocol, making sure that the site, the doctor, the principal investigators, and clinical study coordinators, adhere to protocol, they're giving the subjects the right medication, the investigational product, and that the site is appropriately approved by the Institutional Review Board to conduct that trial.

MR. ROGERS: In your work, do you have a lot of contact with doctors who are involved in running the clinical studies?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely.

MR. ROGERS: I believe you said that the entity that you work for, the company, that they do clinical trials for

```
Amgen; is that right?
 1
 2
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
 3
               MR. ROGERS: Is that the only company they do
 4
      clinical trials for?
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm sorry, what's your question
 6
      again?
 7
               MR. ROGERS: I'm sorry. Is Amgen the only company
 8
      that your company does clinical trials for?
 9
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm only involved in the Amgen
10
      product, Amgen studies. Like I said, my company right now is
11
      IQVIA, which was merged with IMC. Used to be Quintiles. I
12
      know I have other colleagues that work with other, we call it
13
      FSP, which means other sponsors. But for me, I specifically
14
      work on the Amgen trials.
15
               MR. ROGERS: And does your company do any clinical
16
      trials for any medical device companies?
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not that I know of.
18
               MR. ROGERS: All right. Thank you, Juror Number 4.
19
               Juror Number 18, would you mind if I asked you a
20
      couple of questions?
21
               And, ma'am, again, I'm trying to understand what it
      is that you do. Can you first explain for me who the company
2.2
23
      is you work for and what they do.
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's Standard Aero.
25
               THE COURT: Excuse me, ma'am, can you hold the mic up
```

1 closer. 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's Standard Aero. It's a 3 plating company where we do chemicals for airplanes. MR. ROGERS: And so can you explain for us what your 4 5 job is, what you do on a day-to-day basis. 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: We prepare parts for aircrafts. 7 So chemical -- so platers do the chemical part for the parts 8 for the airplanes. 9 MR. ROGERS: And are you involved yourself in 10 handling the chemicals? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 11 12 MR. ROGERS: So day-to-day what it is that you do? 1.3 More administrative or more hands-on? 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: More hands-on. 15 MR. ROGERS: And can you try to tell me a little bit 16 more about that. 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, we just prepare parts for 18 chemicals, like putting tape on the areas where they're not 19 going to be plating. 20 MR. ROGERS: Ma'am, I believe you indicated on your 21 questionnaire that you had a family member that was involved 2.2 in a lawsuit; is that right? 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 24 MR. ROGERS: Would you mind if I asked you a question 25 about that? Is that okay?

```
1
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's okay.
 2
               MR. ROGERS: I understand it was your father; is that
 3
      correct?
 4
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, that's my father.
 5
               MR. ROGERS: And am I correct that he brought a suit
 6
      that sounds like a medical malpractice suit; is that right?
 7
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
 8
               MR. ROGERS: And is there anything about that
 9
      experience, having seen your father go through that, that you
      think would lead you to be unfair or impartial in this case?
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
11
12
               MR. ROGERS: Do you think you could listen to all the
1.3
      evidence and be fair to both sides?
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
15
               MR. ROGERS: Okay. Thank you, ma'am.
16
               Juror Number 25, please.
17
               Ma'am, again, I'm trying to understand what it is
18
      that you do. I believe you said that you worked for Banner
19
      Wound Care; is that correct?
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
21
               MR. ROGERS: And I think your questionnaire said that
2.2
      you were a medical scheduler; is that right?
23
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. I schedule the new patients
24
     that come into our clinic.
25
               MR. ROGERS: So as part of your job, do you have a
```

```
lot of contact directly with patients?
 1
 2
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. It's over the phone.
 3
               MR. ROGERS: And how about doctors, do you have a lot
 4
      of day-to-day contact with doctors?
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, doctors that come into our
 6
      clinic.
 7
               MR. ROGERS: And so what sort of interactions would
 8
      you have with those medical professionals?
 9
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Just if we're -- if I have an
10
      authorization pending for a patient that's coming in. Not
11
      really too much.
12
               MR. ROGERS: So would you consider it more
1.3
      administrative? Would that be accurate?
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
15
              MR. ROGERS: Okay. Thank you, ma'am.
16
               Poor Juror 28, you've been on your feet a lot.
17
               I do want to understand a little bit more about what
      you do. I think you said that you were a circulating nurse;
18
19
      is that correct?
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's correct, yes.
21
               MR. ROGERS: Can you tell me what it is you do, kind
      of day in and day out what your responsibilities are.
2.2
23
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Day in, day out I prepare the
24
      operating room for the particular surgery that we're going to
25
     be doing. Myself and scrub tech set up the room, get
```

everything counted appropriately, and then I go out to the 1 2 preop area and actually interview the patient along with the 3 anesthesiologist, find out their health history. And once we 4 see the surgeon, I bring the patient actually back to the 5 operating room, assist in getting them off to sleep. And then 6 during the surgery, get anything that we might need during it. 7 And then also I'm responsible for all the charting during the 8 surgery. And then when we're all done, I take the patient out 9 to the recovery room. And then do that 12 more times. 10 MR. ROGERS: And do you have contact with multiple representatives from medical device companies? 11 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's correct. 13 MR. ROGERS: Not just a person from C.R. Bard; is 14 that right? 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's correct. 16 MR. ROGERS: And are they kind of in and out of there 17 all the time? 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: They're in and out of there all 19 the time, yes. That particular sales rep is selling mesh, and 20 so she comes in and answers any questions that the surgeon 21 might have about that particular mesh that we're putting in a 2.2 patient. But, yes, multiple different representatives from 23 all types of companies.

MR. ROGERS: And have you had any experiences with

any of those representatives that would lead you to view

24

```
medical device companies in an unfavorable way?
 1
 2
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I have not.
 3
               MR. ROGERS: Okay. Thank you.
 4
               Next is Juror Number 31.
 5
               How are you?
 6
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Just fine, thank you.
 7
               MR. ROGERS: Good.
 8
               And, ma'am, I understand you're retired; is that
 9
      correct?
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct.
               MR. ROGERS: But if I'm reading your questionnaire
11
12
      correctly, you used to work at the VA Medical Center; is that
13
      right?
14
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct.
15
               MR. ROGERS: Can you tell me what you did there?
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was a LPN nurse on -- our floor
17
      specialized in medical patients. I mean not specialized. It
18
      was a medical floor, but we specialized on oncology.
19
               MR. ROGERS: And so what were your duties when you
20
      were an LPN?
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My duties were to do patient
21
      care, administer medications, IVs that are not narcotic,
2.2
23
      certain care for patients who are -- have some type of tubing
24
      like Duo-Tubes. Patients that are not able to eat, we had to
25
      care for that.
```

```
1
               MR. ROGERS: So sounds like you had a lot of direct
2
     patient care.
 3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right. Right.
 4
               MR. ROGERS: And it looks like you are working
5
      currently too; is that right?
 6
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, but not in my special field
7
     due to knee problems and back problems. So I'm doing it
8
     part-time --
9
               MR. ROGERS: Can you tell me what you do now.
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Now I'm just -- I work at the
11
     LP- -- LBJ jail. It's Maricopa County, the jail, and I sit
12
      and monitor the patients because it's in a psych facility.
13
     And monitor to make sure they're safe. Or do no harm to
14
     themselves.
15
              MR. ROGERS: And so you continue to have a lot of
16
     direct patient care, sounds like?
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not direct. I just sit and watch
18
      them and make sure they don't hurt themselves. Mostly the
19
      staff there does the direct care. Or the DOs.
20
               MR. ROGERS: Okay. Thank you, ma'am.
21
               Juror Number 52.
2.2.
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.
23
               MR. ROGERS: How are you, sir?
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good. Thanks.
25
               MR. ROGERS: I understand you are a veterinarian; is
```

that correct? 1 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct. 3 MR. ROGERS: Could you tell me what sort of practice 4 you have as a veterinarian? 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Small animal. 6 MR. ROGERS: And are you in your own practice? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. And we have multiple 8 locations. 9 MR. ROGERS: So you work with multiple other vets; is 10 that right? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 11 12 MR. ROGERS: Let me follow up on something you got 13 asked by Mr. O'Connor. And you were asked specifically as to 14 whether or not you were going to hold the plaintiffs to a 15 certain burden of proof that may be higher. Do you recall 16 that? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 18 MR. ROGERS: And if you were to be put into this case 19 as a juror and you sat and you listened to the evidence for 20 two and a half weeks or so and you were instructed by the 21 Judge as to what the legal burdens are on the parties, do you 2.2 think you could appropriately apply those burdens? 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think so. I would make every 24 attempt.

MR. ROGERS: And do you think you could be fair and

```
impartial to both sides in that effort?
1
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
2
                                   I do.
 3
               MR. ROGERS: All right. Thank you, sir.
 4
               Your Honor, I don't have any further questions.
 5
               THE COURT: All right. Thanks, Mr. Rogers.
 6
               Ladies and gentlemen, from what you have seen, did
7
      any of you know any other member of the jury panel before this
8
     morning?
9
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (Juror 29) 88, Juror 88.
10
               THE COURT: You are Juror 29?
11
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm 29. We have a common friend
12
      and we most commonly ran into each other at intermission at
13
      the Herberger.
14
               THE COURT: Okay. If you and the other juror were
15
     placed on the jury together, could you exercise independent
16
      judgment and not be unduly influenced by his views?
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely.
               THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to ask the same question
18
19
      of Juror -- is it 88?
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (Juror 88) Yes.
21
               THE COURT: Oh, I called you a him. I'm sorry,
2.2.
             I thought he was pointing to somebody else.
23
               Same question for you. If you were on the jury with
24
      Juror 29, could you exercise independent views and not be
25
     unduly influenced by his views?
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (Juror 88) Yes.
1
2
               I also -- I don't remember your name, but there's a
 3
     PE teacher I've worked with years and years ago.
 4
               Yes.
 5
               THE COURT: You are Juror Number --
 6
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (Juror 23) 23.
7
               THE COURT: -- 23.
8
               Same question. If you were on the jury with
9
      Juror 23, could you exercise your own independent judgment?
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (Juror 88) Yes.
11
               THE COURT: Should I ask you, Juror 23, if you
12
      remember Juror 88?
13
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (Juror 23) Looks a little
14
      familiar.
15
               THE COURT: Could you be independent if you were on
16
      the jury with her?
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (Juror 23) Yes, I would be.
18
               THE COURT: Okay. Thanks.
19
               Anybody else know any other member of the jury panel?
20
               Okay. Give me just a minute.
21
               All right.
               Ladies and gentlemen, we, the lawyers and I, are now
2.2.
23
     going to go through the process of choosing the jury, and that
24
     takes a bit of time. So we're going to excuse you again and
25
     ask that you be back up here in a half hour. So by -- well,
```

```
I'll tell you what. Instead of that, it's warm outside on
 1
 2
      this floor, as you know, why don't you be in the jury room, if
 3
      you would, downstairs by 11:35. That's in a half hour. It's
 4
      air conditioned.
 5
               We'll call down there when we're ready. That way you
 6
      won't be waiting up outside the doors here for ten minutes if
 7
      we run a little long.
 8
               I would like to ask that the following jurors remain
 9
     behind for just a minute: Jurors 16, 44, and 59.
10
               Anyone else, Counsel? I think those were the
11
      remaining three from what we talked about this morning.
12
               MR. O'CONNOR: That's consistent with my notes.
13
               MR. ROGERS: May we have a brief sidebar, Your Honor?
14
               THE COURT: Sure.
15
               Hold on just a minute, ladies and gentlemen.
16
           (Bench conference as follows:)
17
               MR. WENNER: Morning, Your Honor.
18
               THE COURT: Good morning.
19
               MR. ROGERS: Apparently my client knew something I
20
      didn't know, and that is that Juror Number 4 used to work for
21
      a -- she mentioned it, it's called Quintiles, which is a
2.2
      clinical trial company and they have done work for C.R. Bard.
23
               THE COURT: Okay. Then let's have Juror 4 remain
24
     behind as well.
25
              MR. ROGERS: Yes, Your Honor.
```

```
MR. O'CONNOR: I didn't hear what you said.
 1
               THE COURT: You can talk as you walk back, but I'll
 2
 3
      have Juror 4 remain behind.
 4
           (Bench conference concludes.)
 5
               THE COURT: Let's also have Juror 4 remain for a
 6
     minute, if you would. So Jurors 4, 16, 44, and 59, please
 7
      wait here for just a minute.
 8
               We will excuse the rest of you. And please be in the
 9
      jury room at 11:35 and we'll get you up here as soon as we
10
      can.
11
               You can hand those sheets to Traci as you leave.
12
      When you come back, you don't have to sit in the same seats.
1.3
           (Excused jury panelists exit the courtroom.)
14
               THE COURT: Okay. Please be seated.
15
               Jurors 4 and 16, why don't you remain here for a
16
     minute.
17
               Jurors 44 and 59, if you would just step outside the
18
      double door. You can wait right there; we'll get you in here
19
      in about three minutes.
20
               All right. Juror 4, there's a follow-up question or
     two that we need to ask you.
21
               Mr. Rogers, you can do it right there if you want,
22
23
     talk right into that mic.
24
               MR. ROGERS: I'm sorry I held you back, but
25
      apparently there was something I wasn't familiar with. But
```

```
did you say you worked for a company called Quintiles; is that
 1
 2
      correct?
 3
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Quintiles, yes. Quintiles merged
 4
      with INC and now called IQVIA, that's the one I work with.
 5
      And I started working with them in January 2018. Prior to
 6
      that I worked with InVentiv Health, which has merged with INC
 7
      to become Syneos.
 8
               MR. ROGERS: And at what point were you working for
 9
      Ouintiles?
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I didn't work with Quintiles. I
10
      work with IQVIA. But just letting you know that they merged
11
12
      with INC to form IQVIA. So I work with IQVIA. I never worked
1.3
      with Quintiles.
14
              MR. ROGERS: Thank you.
15
               And have you, to your knowledge, ever worked for any
16
      company that's done any sort of work related to C.R. Bard?
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. No.
18
               MR. ROGERS: Okay. Thanks, Juror 4.
19
               THE COURT: Thank you, Juror 4.
20
               Plaintiffs' counsel, any questions?
21
               MR. O'CONNOR: None, Your Honor. Thank you.
2.2
               THE COURT: Juror 4, we'll go ahead and excuse you.
23
      Just be in the jury room at 11:35, please.
24
               Okay. Counsel, follow-up questions for
25
      Juror Number 16.
```

```
Mr. O'Connor, I didn't know if you had the questions
1
2
      or if defense counsel did.
               MR. O'CONNOR: Now that you're here privately --
 3
               THE COURT: You've got to speak into a mic,
 4
 5
     Mr. O'Connor.
 6
               MR. O'CONNOR: I forget that all the time.
7
               Just needed some information that you didn't provide
8
      in your questionnaire.
9
               First of all, in response to the question about
10
      family members and what they do for a living, you said
      "privacy." I know there were categories, accounting,
11
12
      engineering, medical. Can you tell us --
13
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My husband's a physician.
14
              MR. O'CONNOR: What type of physician is he?
15
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Hospitalist.
16
              MR. O'CONNOR: Do you know what hospital he works at?
17
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Estrella Banner. Banner
18
      Estrella. Banner Estrella in Phoenix.
19
               MR. O'CONNOR: And does he get involved in medical
20
      devices?
21
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. He just follows up with the
2.2.
     patients. I'm sure he deals with the patients with medical
23
     devices. I never discuss with him about it.
24
               MR. O'CONNOR: I thought -- and what your husband
25
     does, is that a reason that you have expressed your feelings
```

against plaintiff attorneys?

2.2

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I have nothing against plaintiff attorneys, it's just against the companies to be sued that are trying to improve our lives on daily basis. That's the only thing I'm against. Nothing to do with plaintiffs' attorneys. Because in some cases I strongly believe certain companies do need --

MR. O'CONNOR: All right. I just --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: -- do need to be held responsible.

MR. O'CONNOR: Let me just get to another question here.

And the reason we're asking and why it's important to us is because when you answered question 36, you put a 1 for personal injury lawyers, which means you have extreme negative feelings.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't -- I don't have personal injury -- maybe it was mistake, I'm sorry, but I don't have any personal injuries. I never had any personal injuries.

MR. O'CONNOR: My question is a little different. There's a question number 36 and it asked you to rank your feelings, being extremely negative as a 1 to extremely positive, and when it came to personal injuries you put a 1, meaning you feel extremely negative towards personal injury attorneys. That's what we want to follow up.

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. It depends, again.
1
2
      Because I read what the case was about. So according to this
 3
      case, I'm strong against this case.
 4
               MR. O'CONNOR: Pardon me?
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Because the person is well, I
 6
     mean recovered the surgery and alive today and in our society
7
      and with their families, I strongly believe this case
8
      shouldn't be happening. That's why I did only for this case.
9
     Not in general.
10
               MR. O'CONNOR: I appreciate that. Thank you.
11
               THE COURT: Anything from defense?
12
               MR. ROGERS: No, Your Honor.
1.3
               THE COURT: Okay. Thanks, Juror 16. If you could be
14
      downstairs at 11:35 --
15
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Can I stay upstairs, though?
16
      It's warmer.
17
               THE COURT: You sure can.
18
               Traci, would you have Juror 44 come in, please.
19
               Juror 44, you are good right there if you don't mind
20
      standing for a minute. We'll do this quickly.
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I prefer standing. Thank you.
2.1
2.2.
               THE COURT: There were follow-up questions for
23
      Juror 44? Mr. O'Connor?
24
               MR. O'CONNOR: Yes.
25
               THE COURT: Let's have you talk into a mic so Tricia
```

1 can hear you. 2 MR. O'CONNOR: Number 44, we just wanted to follow up 3 with you. You were asked questions in your questionnaire. 4 Question 50 was whether you had a relative or someone close to 5 you that was diagnosed with blood clots, deep vein thrombosis, 6 or pulmonary embolism, and your response was "private." So we 7 would like to follow up with you on that. 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's still private. 9 MR. O'CONNOR: Pardon me? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's still private. 11 MR. O'CONNOR: The reason we're asking, obviously we 12 need to know some of the deals about that experience. We're 13 not trying to pry, but --14 THE COURT: Let me ask it this way, Mr. O'Connor. 15 Juror 44, would the experience you've had with that 16 affect your ability to be a fair juror in this case? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. Not at all. THE COURT: Then I think we do need to know a bit 18 more about it, if that's all right. 19 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My mother died from a deep vein 21 thrombosis. Pulmonary embolism traveled from her leg. I have 2.2 similar conditions. I will die from this condition most 23 likely. I'm not treating it with a box or a pill, I'm just 24 preparing my life.

THE COURT: Okay.

1 Go ahead, Mr. O'Connor. 2 MR. O'CONNOR: And Number 44, do you have beliefs or 3 philosophies that prevent from you seeking treatment? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 4 5 MR. O'CONNOR: Have you ever been advised that you 6 should receive treatment and received recommendations for the 7 type of treatment you should receive? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have. 9 MR. O'CONNOR: And have you declined that treatment? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have not responded positively to that treatment invitation. 11 12 MR. O'CONNOR: Pardon me? 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have not responded in the 14 positive to that offer. I have not taken anybody up on that 15 offer for treatment. 16 MR. O'CONNOR: Were you ever recommended an IVC 17 filter? 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't know what that is. 19 MR. O'CONNOR: Okay. So you don't have any 20 background or experience --21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I'm really quite sano 2.2 between the ears. I have no idea about what this trial is 23 about and I have no idea about the treatment available to me. 24 I just answered that question on the questionnaire as I did. 25 MR. O'CONNOR: Okay. Thank you.

```
1
               Is there anything else, David?
 2
               Thank you, sir, I appreciate that.
 3
               THE COURT: Mr. Rogers -- hold on, Juror Number 44.
 4
      Just a minute. Let's give the other side a chance.
 5
               MR. ROGERS: I just wanted to ask a very brief
 6
      follow-up question.
 7
               Is the treatment that you have been offered, if you
 8
      don't mind sharing it with us, has it been -- I think you said
 9
      it was drugs; is that right?
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't recall mention about
10
11
      drugs.
12
               MR. ROGERS: Okay. So --
1.3
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Is blood thinner a drug? I don't
14
     even know if that's a drug.
15
               MR. ROGERS: There are several blood thinners that
16
      are drugs, yes.
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That was referenced and that's
      the only thing I remember.
18
19
               MR. ROGERS: Okay. And you've made an election not
20
     to pursue the use of --
21
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: At this point in my life, that's
2.2.
      correct.
23
               MR. ROGERS: Okay. Thank you, sir.
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you.
25
               THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
```

```
1
               Traci, could you have Juror 59 come in, please.
 2
               Juror 59, thanks very much for remaining behind for a
 3
     minute.
 4
               Plaintiffs' counsel, you had a follow-up question, I
 5
      think.
 6
               MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, this is one that I had
 7
      asked --
 8
               THE COURT: Oh. Go ahead, Mr. Rogers.
 9
               MR. ROGERS: Hello, sir. How are you? And thank you
10
      for coming back.
               I just wanted to follow up about some of the things
11
12
      that you had in your questionnaire. And it sounds like you
13
      had an experience with a family member that expired; is that
14
      correct?
15
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Three years ago and six days.
16
               MR. ROGERS: And it sounds like there was some
17
      lawsuit that was brought as a result of that?
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My parents sought. Yeah.
19
               MR. ROGERS: Is that suit still ongoing?
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
21
               MR. ROGERS: Has the suit resolved?
2.2
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. They -- it ran out of steam.
23
     My parents were left --
24
               MR. ROGERS: Understand. And one of the things I
25
     need to specifically follow up on, you had marked in response
```

to a question that indicated that you weren't sure if you 1 2 could apply the law fairly and impartially in this case based 3 on that experience. 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It is a concern. 5 MR. ROGERS: And is that something that you feel like 6 you were biased against the medical community? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not necessarily. But it would --I -- I would be afraid it would shade my consideration. 8 9 MR. ROGERS: Do you feel like you would favor the 10 plaintiff over the defendant in this case with the defendant being a medical product company? 11 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not necessarily. 13 MR. ROGERS: And is there some reason why you feel 14 like you might favor the defendant over the plaintiff? 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 16 MR. ROGERS: Okay. I'm just trying to understand 17 what your concern is, if you don't mind helping me out. 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, it's still pretty fresh 19 circumstance. And I think -- I think, and the judge mentioned 20 this at the beginning, that perhaps it's possible to set aside 21 a personal experience like that. I'm not certain. I would make every effort to be impartial, but I can't say that that 2.2 23 life experience, because it was substantial in my life, it 24 wouldn't shade my -- shade my thinking. 25 But, again, I'm a fairly intelligent person, so I

think I would be able to set it aside.

2.2.

MR. ROGERS: Is it fair to say that even if you did your best to try to set aside that personal experience, that you still have some reservation that you may not be able to do that and that it could impact the way you would decide this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think -- I think understanding more of the -- more of the case, because all I was given was a synopsis, an overview, that I would be able to make a decision based on that. Or I would hope so.

MR. ROGERS: But is there any doubt in your mind that you could -- that you may not be able to do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I wouldn't say the word "no" would apply. I --

THE COURT: Let me jump in, Juror 59. What I'm hearing you saying, sir, tell me if this is right, is that you've had experience that is still fresh enough in your mind, still enough a part of you, that it is possible it could have an influence. You don't know that because you don't know the case, but it's something that is very present in your life.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. I -- the circumstances are different because it wasn't a medical device circumstance, it was improper standard of care. So I think it would be difficult. But, again, using what your instructions were at the very beginning of this process, I think I could still be

```
impartial.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: Okay. Thanks.
 3
               Did you have more questions, Mr. Rogers?
 4
               MR. ROGERS: No, Your Honor.
 5
               THE COURT: Mr. O'Connor?
 6
               MR. O'CONNOR: Yes, some follow-up.
 7
               We're sorry for your loss.
 8
               You said that the case lost steam. Does that mean
 9
      the case just stopped, didn't go any further?
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: The attorneys, I don't know who
      they were, hopefully not you, but they lost interest in the
11
12
      case. It started to move along pretty well. We had -- my
13
      parents. I say "we." It was my sister, so -- but we had
14
      quite a bit of steam at the beginning, had a witness, somebody
15
      who was directly involved who was probably putting their
16
      medical license at risk in supporting our -- supporting our
17
      claim.
18
               MR. O'CONNOR: Your parents retained lawyers, I take
19
      it?
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely, yes.
21
               MR. O'CONNOR: Is there anything about that and the
2.2.
      loss of interest that would affect the feelings you may have
23
      against lawyers that represent people on our side?
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Possibly.
25
              MR. O'CONNOR: You do have feelings?
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I don't know that it would
1
      influence my decision. Again, I don't know -- I don't
2
 3
      recollect the name of the attorneys.
 4
               MR. O'CONNOR: And fair enough. And I appreciate --
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                  That's more personally animus
 6
      against those particular individuals more likely. But, again,
7
      not knowing who they are, I can't --
8
               MR. O'CONNOR: Do you feel, based upon that
9
      experience, that you are suspicious and do have some concerns
10
      about people who represent people bringing claims?
11
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not necessarily, no. No. I get
12
      sued all the time.
13
               MR. O'CONNOR: Pardon me?
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I get sued all the time.
15
              MR. O'CONNOR: Okay. I'm sorry about that.
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's all right.
17
              MR. O'CONNOR: I wanted to follow up with one other
     point. What do you do for a living?
18
19
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm in residential property
20
     management.
2.1
               MR. O'CONNOR: And that's where the lawsuits --
2.2.
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely. Against my company
23
      and my PLLC, not against me personally.
24
               MR. O'CONNOR: It sounds as though, as you sit here
25
     today, it's going to be difficult for you to start out this
```

case neutral; you can't predict if you're going to be able to 1 2 set aside your feelings. Is that fair? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't think that's accurate. Ι 4 don't think that's characterized properly. 5 I think that -- like I said, I think I would make 6 every effort to -- to approach it in a -- as an impersonal 7 process as I possibly could. MR. O'CONNOR: Now, there's going to be testimony 8 9 from doctors in this case. And knowing that, the experience 10 with your parents in that case, is that going to affect you in terms of how you look or view or assess the credibility of 11 12 medical professionals that come in here and testify? 1.3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Possibly, yeah. 14 MR. O'CONNOR: Okay. Thanks. So you just don't know 15 that you may be looking at a medical professional --16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: And harboring suspicion. 17 MR. O'CONNOR: Pardon me? 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: And harboring suspicion, to 19 finish your thought. Possibly. I -- I -- I honestly can't --20 this is the difficulty I had in the way I answered it in my 21 questionnaire. I wouldn't want to be unduly influenced by a 2.2 personal experience, and that would be my fear. 23 MR. O'CONNOR: Fair enough. 24 THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much, 25 Juror 59.

```
1
               All right. Counsel, I'm going to identify the jurors
 2
      that I'm going to excuse for hardship.
 3
               I'm going to excuse --
 4
               Are you ready, Traci?
 5
               THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Yes.
 6
               THE COURT: -- Juror Number 2, 5, 21, 28, 51, 62,
 7
      we've already excused Juror 68, 70, and 106.
 8
               So, Counsel, to save time on challenges for cause,
 9
      let's initially just have you state challenges to cause
10
      through Juror 74, because I don't think we'll need higher than
11
      that. If we do, we'll come back to them.
12
               So Juror 3 through 74, plaintiffs' counsel, do you
13
     have challenges for cause?
14
               MR. O'CONNOR: I'll let Mr. Wenner take that,
15
      Your Honor.
16
               THE COURT: That's fine.
17
               If you want to stay seated, Counsel, that's fine.
      Just be sure you've got the mic right in front of you.
18
19
               MR. WENNER: First one is Juror Number 16,
20
      Your Honor.
21
               THE COURT: Let's do what we did before. That is,
2.2.
     have you identify them, see if the defendants agree or
23
      disagree. If they disagree I'll hear reasons.
24
               MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, I wish I could come up with
25
     a reason to keep Juror 16, but I don't think there is one.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: All right. I'm going to grant the
 2
      challenge for cause to Juror 16. I think she was very clear
 3
      in her answers that she could not be a neutral juror.
 4
               MR. WENNER: Juror -- I have Juror Number 20.
 5
               THE COURT: All right. Let's hear -- Juror --
 6
              MR. WENNER: Juror Number 20 --
 7
               THE COURT: Let's hear if defense counsel agree or
 8
      disagree first.
 9
               MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, I believe she is also
10
      somebody we're going to agree with.
11
               THE COURT: All right. I'm going to grant the
12
      challenge for cause to Juror 20. She said she cannot set
1.3
      aside her favorable views of device manufacturers.
14
               Next one, plaintiffs' counsel.
15
              MR. WENNER: Number 50, Your Honor.
16
               THE COURT: Let's first hear defense counsel's views.
17
              MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, I would not agree with
18
      Juror 50.
19
               THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead, let's hear plaintiffs'
20
      reasons.
21
              MR. WENNER: Yes, Your Honor. Mr.- --
2.2
               THE COURT: Let's not mention names.
23
               MR. WENNER: Okay. Juror 50 basically said he
24
      started out with very favorable feelings against medical
25
      device companies. He doesn't like lawsuits against
```

corporations with wealth. And essentially he starts out with bias in favor of the medical device manufacturers. And so, I don't know, in light of the fact we have so many jurors, I just don't see how we can keep a juror like that in light of the predisposition in favor of medical device manufacturers. "Very favorable feelings," I wrote down.

He doesn't like lawsuits against corporations with wealth. We're going to be talking about the wealth of this corporation. This is a large, very large, wealthy corporation. Starts out -- we start out, I think, in a one-down position in this case with this particular juror, Number 50.

THE COURT: Mr. Rogers.

1.3

2.2.

MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, I believe that Juror 50 consistently said that all cases are different, he needs to hear the facts of the case. He said he could set aside his biases, and I think he was very clear he would have to hear the facts of this case and the evidence and he could make a decision on that.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, you're right, Mr. Rogers, he said that. There are some instances where I have to make a decision on the basis of demeanor. And on the basis of Juror 50's demeanor, I'm going to grant the challenge for cause. I just had doubts after he finished about his fairness.

1 All right, next one for plaintiffs. 2 MR. WENNER: Your Honor, Juror Number 52. Juror 3 Number 52 --4 THE COURT: Before you make your argument, let's hear 5 defense views. 6 MR. WENNER: Sorry, Your Honor. 7 MR. ROGERS: I disagree, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Okay, go ahead. 9 MR. WENNER: Juror Number 52, he -- first of all, in 10 his questionnaire he said he has very unfavorable feelings 11 about personal injury lawyers, he's got concerns about 12 frivolous lawsuits. Those questions 57 through 59, you know, 13 he answered that too many lawsuits, too much -- he doesn't --14 the damages are too high, believes in caps. 15 But specifically in court he said that he would 16 require a higher burden of proof because of, and I quote, 17 prejudices that he has, and he would hold the plaintiff to a 18 higher burden of proof. And he said, "I don't know if I can 19 be fair and impartial." And so I think that under any 20 circumstances this juror needs to be struck for cause. 21 THE COURT: Mr. Rogers. 2.2 MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, Juror 52 stated that he 23 could listen to the evidence and apply the law regarding 24 burdens as instructed. I think that his general demeanor was 25 that he could be fair and impartial if he was provided the

```
sufficient evidence in order to do so.
1
2
               THE COURT: Juror 52 gave answers both ways. At one
 3
     point he said he did not know if he could be fair and
 4
      impartial. Later, he said that he thought he could be fair
5
      and impartial.
 6
               He did say that he would start with a higher burden
7
     of proof on plaintiff. Plaintiff does have the burden of
     proof, but I didn't think that's what he was talking about.
8
9
               So I'm going to grant the challenge for cause to
      Juror 52.
10
               MR. WENNER: The next one is Juror Number 59.
11
               THE COURT: Let's hear defense's view.
12
13
               MR. ROGERS: I would agree, Your Honor.
14
               THE COURT: I'm going to grant the challenge for
15
      cause to Juror 59. It was evident that the loss of his family
16
     member is a very fresh memory for him and he was concerned it
17
     might have some influence. So I will grant that challenge.
18
               Any others from plaintiff?
19
               MR. WENNER: Let me --
20
               THE COURT: We're stopping at 74.
21
               MR. WENNER: Right.
2.2.
               You struck 62 for cause, right, Your Honor, or
23
     hardship?
24
               THE COURT: 62 we excused --
25
               MR. WENNER: Struck for hardship.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: -- for hardship.
 2
               MR. WENNER: Do you have others?
 3
           (Counsel confer.)
 4
               MR. WENNER: Hold on one second, Your Honor, I have
 5
      to get to that particular juror.
 6
               The -- so Juror Number 44, Your Honor. We heard --
 7
               THE COURT: Are you challenging him for cause?
 8
               MR. WENNER: Yes.
 9
               THE COURT: All right.
10
               Defense view?
               MR. ROGERS: Disagree, Your Honor.
11
12
               THE COURT: Go ahead, Counsel.
13
               MR. WENNER: He said that -- I believe he said that
14
      he would possibly have concerns about our side because of his
15
      concerns about plaintiffs' lawyers, that he would be -- the
16
      thing that was difficult about his testimony is he couldn't --
17
      he said he possibly would be biased, but he couldn't tell us
18
      in what way he could be biased in this case.
19
               But it's clear that he's deeply affected by the loss
20
      in this case. Mr. O'Connor asked him about the plaintiffs'
21
      lawyers seeming to be dropping the case, if he gets into this
2.2
      case and he decides somehow that that bias, you know, is
23
      important to his judgments --
24
               THE COURT: I think -- I think you're talking about
25
      Juror 59.
```

1 MR. WENNER: Oh. Am I? 2 (Counsel confer.) 3 MR. WENNER: Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah. You're right, 4 you're right, you're right. 5 I quess Juror Number -- I apologize, Your Honor. 6 Juror Number 44. So we know he's being untreated for his 7 blood clots. His mother died of a blood clot. 8 Now, he wasn't sure about IVC filters. If he gets in 9 here and says, wow, that might be a good idea, how can I find 10 against this company when they have such a great product that 11 could save my life, could have saved my mother's life, how can 12 we trust that juror sitting on this case? He has so much 13 personally at stake in this case and how it could come out, 14 how it could turn, that, you know, I think it would be unfair 15 for him to sit as a juror in this case. 16 THE COURT: Mr. Rogers. 17 MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, I didn't hear anything from 18 Juror 44 that indicated a bias. He's clearly got some 19 personal issue as to why he remains untreated, but he said he 20 did not know anything about IVC filters, never heard of them. 21 He said multiple times nothing about his decisions would impact his ability to be fair, no beliefs that prevent him 2.2 23 from being fair. So I didn't hear anything, really, from a 24 bias standpoint from that juror.

THE COURT: I did not either. I don't think he said

anything about bias. But I'm concerned about Juror 44 as a 1 2 person who says he will die from a DVT or PE; his mother died; 3 he's turned down medical advice; and he couldn't really or 4 wouldn't articulate why. I'm just concerned about a juror who 5 was not as forthcoming as I would expect with these issues and 6 yet has direct personal life experiences that will be touched 7 upon by this trial. So I'm going to grant the challenge for 8 cause to Juror 44. 9 Are there others from plaintiffs' side? 10 MR. WENNER: No, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: All right. 12 Mr. Rogers, from the defense side?

MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, I think our one and only strike for cause is Juror Number 25. She works at Banner Wound Care as a scheduler. I'm sure you will recall her. In Mr. O'Connor's questioning she said she did not want to be involved in the trial and generally just seemed opposed to the idea of being here at all. So, Your Honor, for that reason we would move to strike her for cause.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

MR. WENNER: I would agree, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I will grant the challenge for cause to Juror 25.

Okay. Let's then count up the 15 lowest-numbered jurors that remain and make sure we all end up on the same number.

```
1
               I get through Juror 71. Traci does as well.
 2
      that sound right to you, Counsel?
               Let me just give you the 15 by my count.
 3
 4
               They are Jurors 3 --
 5
               MR. O'CONNOR: I'm sorry, could you start over,
 6
      Your Honor.
 7
               THE COURT: 3, 4, 6, 15, 18, 22, 23, 29, 30, 31, 32,
 8
      46, 58, 67, and 71.
 9
               Does that look right?
10
               MR. ROGERS: Yes, Your Honor.
               THE COURT: Plaintiffs' counsel, does that look
11
12
      right?
1.3
               MR. O'CONNOR: Yeah, that looks good to us.
14
               THE COURT: Okay.
15
               You've got three peremptory strikes per side. Let's
16
      try to do those reasonably quickly. We've had the jurors
17
      waiting for five minutes downstairs. Let us know as soon as
18
      you've identified the three.
19
               You look puzzled, Mr. O'Connor.
20
               MR. O'CONNOR: I hope I didn't --
21
               THE COURT: Pull the mic over.
2.2.
               MR. O'CONNOR: I think I wrote notes on the Judge's
23
      list.
            Is this what we're supposed to use for our strikes or
24
      are we going to get a clean copy?
25
               THE COURT: No, that's what you use. We're not going
```

```
1
      to give it to anybody. I assume you can read your own notes.
 2
               MR. WENNER: We'll make do.
 3
               MR. O'CONNOR: We'll do all right.
 4
               THE COURT: Okay. All we need are the three numbers.
 5
      You don't need to hand us back a clean list.
 6
               MR. O'CONNOR: All right.
 7
               THE COURT: Please move along as expeditiously as
 8
      reasonable.
 9
           (Pause in proceedings from 11:41 to 12:03. Proceedings
10
      resumed in open court with the jury panel present.)
               THE COURT: Please be seated.
11
12
               Counsel, would you come to sidebar, please.
13
           (Bench conference as follows:)
14
               THE COURT: Traci said you had an issue you wanted to
15
      raise.
16
               MR. WENNER: Yes, Your Honor. I wanted to raise a
17
      Batson challenge. The defense struck three jurors, two of
18
      which were black. I think this woman may have been from
19
      Africa. I don't know where she's from, so I don't want to
20
      call her African-American, but she's clearly black. She is
21
      Juror Number 4.
2.2.
               And they struck Juror Number 31. Juror Number 31 was
23
      saying she was an LPN. Under Batson --
24
               THE COURT: I remember who they are. Go ahead.
25
              MR. WENNER: Okay. Under Batson, as you probably
```

well know better than me, they have to have a facially neutral reason other than race being the basis for striking them and it just seems a little curious two out of the three jurors they strike are, you know, black.

(Pause in bench conference.)

1.3

2.2.

THE COURT: We'll be with you in just a minute, ladies and gentlemen.

(Bench conference resumed.)

THE COURT: All right. So I think that the challenge is a prima facie case of discrimination, which is the first step in the Ninth Circuit under a *Batson* challenge and the burden then shifts to the defense to come forward with a nondiscriminatory, meaning race neutral, explanation for the strikes.

MR. ROGERS: I agree, Your Honor.

Sure. Starting with Juror Number 4, she, as you heard, is a clinical research associate. She works for a company that does clinical trials for a drug company. She told or said in the voir dire questioning that she has contacts with doctors who are involved in conducting those trials.

As the Court is aware, the plaintiffs are going to be playing the deposition of Dr. Kandarpa in this case, who is a medical monitor for a clinical trial sponsored by Bard. He is going to have unfavorable things to say about Bard. And that

is our race-neutral reason for striking Juror Number 4.

THE COURT: And 31.

2.2

MR. ROGERS: 31 is an LPN. She said in voir dire that she worked for the Veterans Hospital when she was working, and she took care of oncology patients. She said she had a lot of direct patient care as part of that job. She said that she currently is working for what sounded to me like a hospital connected with the jail, and that she is in a position where she monitors psychiatric patients currently.

And I think that she has a lot of empathy, potentially, for people who are in hospitals and under medical care, and I think that she may identify with the plaintiff in this case, and that is the reason that we struck her.

THE COURT: All right. I think those are race-neutral explanations. So the burden shifts back to plaintiff to make a showing that these reasons are pretext for discrimination.

MR. WENNER: Your Honor, Juror Number -- is it 31?

Juror Number 31 hardly ever spoke. She's an LPN. The fact she could be empathetic towards the plaintiff, she never said that empathy was going to somehow bias her. I understand they can do that, but they can choose to strike whoever they want if it's -- if -- unless it's racially motivated, and it just seems odd that out of the two of three jurors they used their peremptories on, two of them are black.

1.3

2.2.

And the last one, the last juror, I don't see how -what -- I don't think that anything he said was a
justification from --

THE COURT: Let me interrupt you. You're talking about a juror other than the two black jurors now?

MR. O'CONNOR: No, I'm talking about the two black jurors. I don't think anything counsel just said is a justification for defendants to think that somehow that they would -- that she would be an adverse juror. If anything, she may be a good juror for them. The fact she's in the medical field, both in the medical field. They may like the medical witnesses and be more inclined to side -- to side with the defendant.

So -- I don't think it's a close question to

Juror Number 31. Perhaps Juror Number 4 I could see, you

know, that argument. Not on Juror 31. Not even close, in my

mind. So -- she didn't say anything on her questionnaire,

nothing, that put her in a bias category. And the only thing

I can see is that she happens to be African-American.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to deny the *Batson* challenge. The reason I'm going to do it is because the defense has provided, in my view, reasonable race-neutral grounds for having used their peremptory strikes against Jurors 4 and 31.

I understand plaintiffs' counsel doesn't agree with

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

Juror Number 15.

the reasons, but that is not the test. The test is whether they're reasonable race-neutral grounds. I think they are. Therefore, I don't think purposeful discrimination or even nonpurposeful race discrimination has been shown, and so I will deny the Batson challenge. MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, may I state one more thing just for purposes of the record? THE COURT: Yes. MR. ROGERS: In response to what plaintiffs' counsel just stated, Juror 31 in her questionnaire did rank plaintiff's attorneys a 5, devices manufacturers a 4, and corporations a 3. She also has a son who has been sued for downloading music and so she may have bias against businesses. So I just wanted to say that in response to what plaintiffs' counsel said. THE COURT: Okay. That's on the record. (Bench conference concludes.) THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much for your patience, ladies and gentlemen. We're well aware we took a half hour longer than we told you we would. But we've completed the process now of choosing the jury. Traci is going to call forward the nine of you who have been chosen to serve. THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Juror Number 3.

```
Juror Number 18.
 1
               Juror Number 22.
 2
 3
               Juror Number 23. Ma'am, you're going to be right
 4
      here.
 5
               Juror 29.
 6
               Juror 46.
 7
               Juror 58.
 8
               Juror 71.
 9
               THE COURT: All right. For those of you who have
10
      been chosen to serve on the jury, before we excuse the rest of
11
      the jury panel, have any of you thought of anything that you
12
      did not mention in your questionnaire or in response to
13
      questions this morning that could affect your fairness to
14
      serve as a juror in this case?
15
               All right, I see no hands.
16
               For the rest of you -- yes, Juror 4, we'll get those
17
      things to you.
18
               For the rest of you, thank you very much for being
19
      here. We appreciate your presence. We were able to choose
      the jury because you were here.
20
21
               We will excuse you. Please just check in at the jury
2.2.
      office before you leave. We'll excuse you now with our
23
      thanks.
24
           (Excused panelists exit the courtroom.)
25
               THE COURT: Please be seated.
```

All right. Would those of you who have been chosen 1 2 to serve on the jury please stand to be sworn as jurors. 3 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Raise your right hands, 4 please. 5 (The jury is sworn.) 6 THE COURT: Thank you. Please be seated. 7 Ladies and gentlemen, we know you've been waiting for 8 an hour, but during that hour we've been working and we now 9 need to take a lunch break for the benefit of everybody before we actually start the trial. So we're going to excuse you in 10 11 just a moment. But let's figure out for how long. Counsel, how much time do we need to address the 12 13 issue we didn't get to this morning, about openings? 14 MR. LOPEZ: Ten minutes, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Okay. So let's do this, ladies and 16 gentlemen. We will plan to start at 1:30. That will give us 17 time to deal with an issue and then give everybody a lunch 18 break before we start. 19 When you come back, I'll give you some preliminary 20 instructions. We'll then hear opening statements from each 21 side about what they think the evidence will show, and then 2.2. we'll start with our first witness. 23 While you are on lunch break, please remember not to 24 talk to anybody about the case. Don't let anybody talk to you 25 about it.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2.

23

24

25

In fact, in your book you will see there's a badge that says "Juror" on it. We would ask you to wear that when you're in the courthouse. So if you don't go around for lunch and you're just hanging out in the courthouse, put that on and that way people in the courthouse know not to discuss a case anywhere within your earshot. You can take off the numbered stickers you've had. When you leave the courthouse, you don't have to keep the juror badge on unless you want to. We don't have a cafeteria in the courthouse. We have a little kiosk down by the elevators that sells some salads and sandwiches. If you go out the door to Washington and go east, there's a restaurant immediately across 4th Avenue on the south side and one on the north side. There are other restaurants further down into town. When you come back, we'll have you gather in the jury room, and Traci or Nancy will take you out this door and show you where that room is and where to gather. And if you could be there at 1:30, we'll get started with the trial. Counsel, anything else before we excuse the jurors? MR. O'CONNOR: Nothing from our side, Your Honor. MR. ROGERS: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. We'll see you at 1:30.

(The jury exited the courtroom at 12:18.)

```
1
               THE COURT: All right. Please be seated.
 2
               Mr. Lopez, you have some objections to slides, I
 3
      think.
 4
               MR. LOPEZ: Can I approach here, Your Honor?
 5
               THE COURT: You may.
 6
               MR. LOPEZ: The good news is they've gone from
 7
      whatever the number was to about maybe certainly less than
 8
      half of what they originally were.
 9
               Counsel, make sure, you're going to take out
10
      Number 9. And I agree with your addition to the others about
      adding "reported rates."
11
12
               Let me just get to the ones that concern us the most.
13
               I mean, you've heard us talk about this all the time,
14
      Your Honor, about the filters being lifesaving devices. We're
15
      still waiting -- we've had two trials where there's been no
16
      scientific evidence of that.
17
               I don't mind the data on here, but the caption --
               THE COURT: What slide are you talking about?
18
19
               MR. LOPEZ: Slide 22.
20
               THE COURT: I don't have a copy.
21
               MR. LOPEZ: Are these numbered the same?
2.2
               MR. ROGERS: At some point, Ramon, I think they may
23
      start to be one slide off. If we get to that point, I'll let
24
      you know.
25
               THE COURT: So it's in the vicinity of 22?
```

```
MR. LOPEZ: I think that one might actually be 22.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: And it's the one that has "Lifesaving
 3
      Devices" in the title?
 4
               MR. LOPEZ: Right. I don't mind the evidence, but to
 5
      me that's argument, whether or not these things are lifesaving
 6
      devices.
 7
               THE COURT: So what you're objecting to is the
 8
      reference at the beginning of "Lifesaving Devices"?
 9
               MR. LOPEZ: Yes, sir. Yes, Your Honor.
10
               THE COURT: All right.
11
               MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, we do plan to present to the
12
      jury that evidence will show that filters are lifesaving
1.3
      devices and I think, Your Honor, that we will support that
14
      evidence at trial. And this is what we believe the evidence
15
      will show.
16
               THE COURT: All right. I'm going to overrule the
17
      objection in light of the representation that there will be
18
      evidence on that point.
19
               MR. LOPEZ: Slide 52. This one, Your Honor.
20
               THE COURT: 99.99 --
21
               MR. LOPEZ: Bard filters are 99.99 percent effective.
2.2.
               THE COURT: Okay.
               MR. LOPEZ: There's been no evidence to that thus
23
24
      far. I mean, that's argument. I mean, there's no facts that
25
      I'm aware of that have come in in either of the prior two
```

```
trials that show that Bard filters are 99.99 percent
 1
 2
      effective.
 3
               THE COURT: All right.
 4
               Mr. Rogers.
 5
               MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, we believe there is evidence
 6
      of that and it is based on Bard's internal rates for tracking
 7
      that issue.
 8
               And Mr. Lopez -- I told him I would add to certain
 9
      slides it was a reported rate and he accepted that, and if it
      would make him comfortable I can add that same language to
10
      this slide.
11
12
               THE COURT: Do the math for me. What is the internal
13
      data that allows you to tell the jury the evidence will show
14
      99.99 percent effectiveness?
15
               MR. ROGERS: That is the reported rate of PE deaths
16
      with the Bard filters.
17
               THE COURT: All filters?
18
               MR. ROGERS: Well, that specific data point is in
19
      relation to the G2X and the Eclipse filters, which are the
20
      filters we have at issue in this trial.
21
               THE COURT: So you're saying the data will show that
2.2.
      deaths in recipients of G2X and Eclipse filters is less than
23
      one --
24
               MR. ROGERS: .01 percent.
25
               THE COURT: -- one one-hundredth of 1 percent?
```

```
1
               MR. ROGERS: Yes, Your Honor, if that's the way the
 2
      math works out. I'm not real good at that.
 3
               THE COURT: That's what it is, one one-hundredth of
 4
      1 percent.
 5
               Do you disagree that the internal data from Bard will
 6
      show that?
 7
               MR. LOPEZ: That the internal -- the internal data
 8
      shows that there have been that many reports, but this is
 9
      telling the jury that the other 99.99 got hit with a clot and
      the device worked.
10
               We didn't know anything about those other 99.- --
11
12
      this is about effectiveness. He already has in here the
1.3
      reported rates of fractures, migrations in the 90 percentile.
14
      This is telling the jury that 99.99 --
15
               THE COURT: I understand your point.
16
               What is your response to that, Mr. Rogers?
17
               MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, we believe the evidence will
18
      show that. I mean based on the Bard internal rates.
19
               THE COURT: Well, but for this to be right, wouldn't
20
      100 percent of the filters have to have trapped a clot for
21
      them to be --
2.2.
               MR. ROGERS: I would say, Your Honor, close to
23
      100 percent of the patients experienced no known pulmonary
24
      embolism.
25
               THE COURT: Well, but that doesn't say that the clot
```

worked to stop the pulmonary embolism in each of them; right? 1 2 MR. ROGERS: That is correct, Your Honor. I have no 3 data that I could present to the jury that would show that a 4 clot was stopped by every filter that was placed. 5 THE COURT: And isn't that what 99.99 percent effective means? It's effective in stopping clots 6 99.99 percent of the time? 7 MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, I would disagree, but I see 8 9 that's where you're going and if you want me to pull this 10 slide, I'll be glad to do it. THE COURT: I'll sustain the objection to that slide. 11 MR. LOPEZ: The next one is 53. And this is 12 1.3 Dr. Kinney. Dr. Kinney, the risk/benefits claims. They're 14 identifying Dr. Kinney as a plaintiffs' expert. And, of 15 course, the rule has been that if you're going to use the 16 testimony of the other side's expert, you can't -- as 17 testimony, you can't identify that expert as the plaintiffs' 18 ex- -- plaintiffs' expert. 19 Dr. Kinney may or may not testify in this case. 20 Depends on time and his availability. He has not testified 21 thus far so there is no testimony from him about that. 2.2. THE COURT: Mr. Rogers. 23 MR. ROGERS: Well, Your Honor, based on some of 24 Mr. Lopez's prior representations, I thought that Dr. Kinney 25 was going to appear as a witness at the trial. If that's the

```
case, he's testified to this in his deposition so I assume
 1
 2
      he'll testify to this at trial.
 3
               If Mr. Lopez can tell us for sure he's not going to
 4
     be here, I'll be glad to pull the slide.
 5
               MR. LOPEZ: No, I can't say that for sure. But he
 6
      can cross-examine him on this if he does. But if he
      doesn't -- if he's not here --
 7
 8
               THE COURT: Are you going to call him as a witness?
 9
               MR. LOPEZ: If we can. I mean, he's -- depends
10
      whether or not he qualifies as a rebuttal witness. That's the
      only time he's available.
11
12
               THE COURT: So you will only use him as a rebuttal
13
      witness if you use him at all?
14
               MR. LOPEZ: Right. He's not available otherwise.
15
               THE COURT: And if he isn't called as a witness, then
16
      this won't come in; right?
17
               MR. ROGERS: I'm glad to pull the slide if we know
18
     he's not going to be here in the case in chief.
19
               THE COURT: Let's pull it, then, for that reason.
20
               MR. LOPEZ: The one I have the most concern about,
21
      Your Honor, is -- the one I have --
2.2.
               Mark, you have -- oh, here. I'm almost there.
23
               Slide 82. Should say "No Warnings Claim, Design
24
     Defect Only."
25
               I mean, this -- there is a warnings claim, but the
```

warnings claim is the defendants', that their warnings somehow make the device not unreasonably dangerous.

This is going to mislead the jury that warnings — that when we start talking about warnings and the sufficiency of what is in the IFU or the sufficiency of what information they provided as part of their duty to make the device safer, it's going to confuse the jury about whether or not that's something they're supposed to consider in this case.

So what they do here, they say there's no warnings claim and then it's followed by all the slides with the IFU where the jury is going to get a false impression that whatever is stated on these slides are adequate because we're not claiming — there's no warnings claim. That's a legal argument.

THE COURT: I understand the objection.

Mr. Rogers.

1.3

2.2

MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, I was planning on using this slide to let the jury know that there is no warnings case against Bard in this case. But they are going to be hearing about the instructions for use that accompany the product, and I think it's important for them to know that they're going to only be hearing about those instructions that come with the product in the context of how they relate to the design claim. And, Your Honor, I think that's where we are in this case and I think the jury's going to need to understand that.

1.3

2.2.

THE COURT: I'm going to -- I'm going to sustain the objection for this reason, Mr. Rogers. If we say highlighted in yellow "there is no warnings claim," that's suggesting to the jury that the plaintiffs are not challenging the sufficiency of the warnings. And they clearly are when it comes to the warnings' relevancy to whether or not the product is safe. And they clearly asserted a warnings claim that I ruled against them on as a matter of law.

I think it's okay for you to say this is a design defect case and for you to explain to them how, in your view, the risks that are disclosed ensure the safety of the product, which is what the case is about. But I don't think we should say there's no warnings claim because I think they'll infer that means the plaintiffs aren't complaining in any way about the warnings, and they clearly are in the case. So I think we should take that yellow highlighted statement out.

MR. ROGERS: Very good, Your Honor. I just want to make sure it's okay to use this slide if the yellow portion is removed?

THE COURT: I think it's okay to say this is a design defect case because that clearly -- that's what it is.

MR. ROGERS: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Are there others, Mr. Lopez?

MR. LOPEZ: No, Your Honor. I said I was going to be ten minutes or less.

```
1
               THE COURT: You made it in ten minutes. Good job.
 2
               Okay. We will plan to resume at 1:30. I will do the
 3
      instructions and we'll go into openings.
               If you want to pull the lectern over so we'll be
 4
 5
      ready, that will be fine. We'll see you then.
 6
           (Recess taken from 12:29.)
 7
           (End of a.m. session transcript.)
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1 CERTIFICATE 2 3 I, PATRICIA LYONS, do hereby certify that I am duly 4 appointed and qualified to act as Official Court Reporter for 5 the United States District Court for the District of Arizona. 6 7 I FURTHER CERTIFY that the foregoing pages constitute 8 a full, true, and accurate transcript of all of that portion 9 of the proceedings contained herein, had in the above-entitled 10 cause on the date specified therein, and that said transcript was prepared under my direction and control, and to the best 11 12 of my ability. 13 14 DATED at Phoenix, Arizona, this 18th day of September, 2018. 15 16 17 18 19 20 s/ Patricia Lyons, RMR, CRR Official Court Reporter 21 2.2 23 24

25